

SENATE—Friday, January 4, 1991

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1991)

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

* * * *Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever: for wisdom and might are his: And he changeth the times and the seasons: he removeth kings, and setteth up kings: he giveth wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding.*—Daniel 2:20-21.

Eternal God, it is impossible to exaggerate the danger of our times and the immensity of the problems confronting us, nor can we predict the human emotion aroused by the issue of war. But neither is it possible to exaggerate the incalculable resources available in Thee. Help us, Lord, not to struggle as if there is no God to whom we can turn. Help us to realize, "Man's extremity is God's opportunity."

Yesterday, Senators solemnly swore " * * * to support and defend the Constitution * * *," a contract borne in the hearts and minds of our forefathers in their tiny colonial community, struggling with impossible circumstances under the threat of the most powerful military force in the world. They took God seriously, found their direction and resolution in Thee, O Lord. Grant that the Senators in their struggles remember they, too, may turn to Thee to find their way.

In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the standing order, the majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, Members of the Senate, yesterday Members of the leadership proposed to the Senate a series of unanimous-consent requests to establish the process by which the Senate will conduct its business in the coming year. All of them were what may fairly be characterized as routine requests to set up a process for not just the coming weeks but for the full 2 years of this Congress.

For many years now, it has been the practice for the Senate to recess following the formal convening of the new

Senate in early January until later in the month, generally until such time as the President presents his State of the Union Address and his program to the Congress for its consideration.

On November 30, all Senate offices were notified in writing of our intention to proceed in that routine manner and to provide that, during the period between January 3 and January 23, no bills or resolutions would be introduced. That was to permit Senators to use the period between January 3 and January 23 for the drafting of bills, for the numbering to be obtained, and to prepare for their introduction later in the month.

That has been, as I indicated, the normal, standard operating procedure in the Senate for many years. And as I also indicated, all offices were notified in writing on November 30 of our intention to proceed in that manner.

Prior to yesterday, I was unaware that any Senator objected to that procedure. Prior to yesterday, I was unaware that any Senator wished or intended to offer a resolution or any other measure on yesterday or at any time prior to January 23. Had I been aware of any such intention, I certainly would have been prepared to accommodate any Senator's interest in the introduction of resolutions.

I wish to make clear to all Members of the Senate I have no objection to the introduction of any resolutions. We were simply following a standard practice which has been followed in the Senate for many years and with respect to which prior written notice was given to all Senators.

When it became evident yesterday, by way of objection, that some Senators wished to offer resolutions, particularly relating to the Persian Gulf crisis, we proceeded to meet in actually a series of meetings with the Republican leader, with many of our colleagues, to try to work out a process by which we could accommodate that interest and concern. I believe we are now at or very close to having been able to do that, and I hope to be able to propound to the Senate shortly a unanimous-consent request which will accommodate that.

What I would like to do, if it is agreeable to all Senators, is to permit the introduction of resolutions relating to the Persian Gulf crisis today, to permit full and extended debate for as long as any Senator wishes to talk on that or, indeed, any other subject—any Senator is, of course, free to speak on any subject at any time under our rules—and

thereby accommodate the concerns of the Senators who expressed that interest on yesterday.

That is my intention. I believe we have worked it out in a manner which is satisfactory to all of those who expressed a concern yesterday. We are now awaiting final approval by all Senators in that regard, and I hope and expect to be able to propound that request shortly.

If we are able to gain consent to do that, then Senators will be in a position today to introduce such resolutions on that matter as they wish and also to engage in such debate as they wish.

It is my intention not to attempt to limit any discussion today, that we will stay here as long as any Senator wishes to talk. That is a very dangerous statement, I know. But I think it is appropriate under the circumstances.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. Was there a limitation on resolutions as to between concurrent resolutions which need not go to the President and resolutions that would require Presidential signature?

Mr. MITCHELL. If I might suggest to the Senator that perhaps what we could do is to—I was under the impression that the Senator had seen this. I read it at a meeting last night at which the Senator was present. Why do we not put in a quorum call, and I will be pleased to go into this with the Senator.

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business with Senators permitted only to speak therein.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, the full unanimous-consent request setting forth the procedure which I described

* This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

earlier that we hope to follow has been cleared on the Democratic side. Senator DOLE has just received, a short time ago, copies of the full and revised version, and he is consulting on the matter. We hope to hear back from him soon.

In the meantime, so as to conserve time and to permit all Senators who wish to speak to do so, I have obtained this consent which permits Senators only to speak, not to introduce any bills or resolutions of any kind. That will follow as soon as we are able to gain final approval of the consent request which I described earlier. So, for now, any Senator may speak on any subject which he or she wishes to.

I would hope that as soon as we hear from Senator DOLE, and assuming we gain approval for these requests, that whoever is speaking would permit me to interrupt for the purpose of gaining the consent, and then we proceed in the manner that I earlier described.

The acting Republican leader here has indicated this has been cleared with Senator DOLE.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if the distinguished leader will yield, we are advised it is acceptable as stated by the leader, and we appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, on November 6, 1990, I circulated the proposed legislative schedule for the 1st session of the 102d Congress.

This first scheduled recess has now been canceled.

I am inserting the balance of the proposed legislative schedule in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, as was the case with the January recess, all Senators should be aware that this schedule is subject to change.

The proposed legislative schedule is as follows:

SENATE CALENDAR 1991—NONLEGISLATIVE PERIODS, 102D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

February 11-18: Senate not in session.
 February 12: Lincoln's Birthday.
 February 18: Presidents' Day.
 February 19 (Tues.): Senate reconvenes.
 March 25-April 7: Senate not in session.
 March 29: Good Friday.
 March 30: Passover.
 March 31: Easter.
 April 8 (Mon.): Senate reconvenes.
 April 29-May 5: Senate not in session.
 May 6 (Mon.): Senate reconvenes.
 May 27-June 2: Senate not in session.
 May 27: Memorial Day.
 June 3 (Mon.): Senate reconvenes.
 July 1-7: Senate not in session.
 July 4: Independence Day.
 July 8 (Mon.): Senate reconvenes.
 August 5-Sept. 9 (August recess): Senate not in session.
 September 2: Labor Day.
 September 9: Rosh Hashanah.
 September 10 (Tues.): Senate reconvenes.

WAR POWERS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for providing us this opportunity to speak. I understand the necessity of getting the unanimous-consent request cleared on the other side to permit us to introduce this resolution today.

I am hopeful that the White House will not object. I am hopeful that we will be able to introduce the resolution today and put it on the table.

Nonetheless, it is important, as I stated yesterday, that the Senate debate this issue as thoroughly as possible, not after the bullets start flying, not after the dogs of war have been unleashed, but now, before.

At the appropriate time I will introduce the resolution that I sought to introduce yesterday, which simply states that prior to taking any offensive action against Iraq—and it specifically says Iraq—that the President must get explicit authorization by Congress before such action may be initiated.

So hopefully there will be no objection from the White House and the Republican leader will not object to this unanimous-consent request to introduce this resolution today.

I want to take this time to explain the resolution, why I feel it is necessary that we debate this issue now, and perhaps speak a few moments on the issue itself, the Mideast situation.

As I said, Mr. President, this resolution does not address the merits of going to war or not going to war in the Mideast. It does not reach the merits of whether or not sanctions will work or sanctions will not work. This resolution is simply a reaffirmation of what our Founding Fathers deliberated over many days in Philadelphia, what they wrote explicitly into the Constitution probably more clearly than any clause in the Constitution, and that was that Congress alone has the power to make or to declare war. And once war is declared it is the President who is then the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to carry out the mandate of Congress.

So it is simply a straightforward resolution that reaches to the constitutional question, not the War Powers Resolution—which is legislation passed by a previous Congress—but the Constitution itself, and again to reaffirm that neither this President nor any President can commit our troops to offensive military action without explicit authorization of Congress.

The Framers of the Constitution were very, very wary of giving one person the power to declare war. Alexander Hamilton explained that certain interests are "so delicate and momentous" that to entrust them "to the sole disposal" of the President is unwise.

The Framers were further concerned that the judgment to initiate war should not be lightly made. Madison spoke of war as "among the greatest of

national calamities," to use his quote. Thomas Jefferson desired an "effectual check to the Dog of War." George Mason said that he was "for clogging, rather than facilitating war."

James Wilson, one of the most important participants at the Philadelphia Convention, explained the rationale for giving to Congress the power to initiate war. He said, "This system will not hurry us into war." How about that.

We keep hearing from the President that he has lost patience, that we cannot have any more time, that we have a deadline. But James Wilson, one of the participants in the framing of the Constitution said:

This system will not hurry us into war; it is calculated to guard against it. It will not be in the power of a single man, or a single body of men, to involve us in such distress; for the important power of declaring war is vested in the legislature at large; and this declaration must be made with the concurrence of the House of Representatives: from this circumstance we may draw a certain conclusion that nothing but our national interest can draw us into a war.

As a Congressman, Abraham Lincoln wrote that the intent of the Constitution was "that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression"—of war—"upon us."

Originally the Framers had a clause that provided that Congress "make" war—that only Congress have the power to "make" war—but they changed it to "declare" war, in order to give the President "the power to repel certain attacks," and to clarify that it was the Executive's function to "conduct" the war once Congress authorized it.

James Madison wrote that "in no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature and not to the executive department."

So again this unambiguous constitutional mandate was to ensure congressional debate and authorization prior to the entry into war except in the case of sudden attack.

Alexander Hamilton explained in the Federalist Papers:

[T]he President is to be Commander in Chief of the army and navy of the United States. In this respect his authority would be nominally the same with that of the King of Great-Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first General and Admiral of the confederacy; while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies; all which by the Constitution under consideration would appertain to the Legislature.

That is the Congress of the United States.

He made it clear they wanted to not use the word "make" but "declare" in order that the President could repel an actual and sudden invasion of the United States.

So any objective reading of the Constitution itself and the clear language of the Constitution, or any reading of the Federalist Papers, or writings of those who drafted this clear clause in the Constitution, can lead to only one clear and unambiguous conclusion: that only Congress can declare war, and the President has the power to repel attacks and invasions, which is not the situation at hand.

So again this resolution is necessary because we have been adrift in this country for some time, letting the executive branch take us from one military action to another. Whether it is Grenada, whether it is Panama, whether it is Nicaragua, wherever it might be, and now in the Mideast, Congress is not actually taking a position under the Constitution to exert its constitutional mandate.

I will be frank in admitting that there were many in this body in previous times—I will not speak of today—but in previous times who were glad to shift that responsibility to the President. You know, why take a position on it if you do not have to. Let the President get out there on the point. If he wins, they can support it; if he does not, then they can be against it. There has been a lot of talk that Members of Congress want to put themselves in that kind of position. This Senator believes very strongly that each person in this body and in the House must stand up and be counted on this issue. Are you for it or are you against it?

This Senator believes quite clearly that the President cannot conduct offensive military operations in the Mideast unless he gets prior approval from Congress. As I said yesterday, now is the time and here is the place to debate this issue, not after the bullets start flying. After that, a different dynamic takes place. Are you going to support our young men and women who are in combat? Are you going to rally around the flag and support this country in its hour of need? Then the dynamics change. Now is the time to debate this crucial issue of the powers of the Presidency.

Much has been alluded to by speakers on the floor of the Senate yesterday that no one was contacted about this resolution; that there are standard procedures that we followed in the past; that we would come in, we would swear Senators in, and then we would go away and come back after the President sent down his budget and his message to Congress.

Those are normal times. But these are not normal times. We have upwards of 400,000, or soon will have 400,000, American troops in the Mideast. There is a date of January 15 set by a U.N. resolution prompted by the United States, confirmed by the Security Council, after which member nations are allowed to use force in order to get Iraqi troops out of Kuwait. All that has

happened since this body last met in October.

When we left in October, many of us were under the very clear and distinct impression that the President of the United States had made a decision to continue to enforce sanctions, economic sanctions, against Iraq, to take all diplomatic and economic means necessary to get Iraq out of Kuwait.

As I travel around my home State of Iowa, I find that people are somewhat confused about just why are we there; what is our goal? The goal has changed. One time it is to get the Government of Kuwait back in power. At another time it is because of oil. Another time we are told it is because of jobs. Another time because Saddam Hussein is worse than Hitler, and we cannot allow this to happen. The reasons for us being there seem to change as the winds change.

When we left in October, on at least eight occasions, the President of the United States was quoted as saying that sanctions were working; that we should have patience. On October 19, to the National Italian American Foundation at the White House, I quote the President:

I think the bottom line is he (Saddam) can't prevail. So, we're going to stay with this, stay the course and send a strong moral message out there, and a simple one: One big country can't bully its neighbor and take it over.

On October 1, the President was quoted as saying:

I have heard * * * more optimism in various quarters that the sanctions are really beginning to bite hard.

On September 11, before a joint session of Congress, the President said:

Let no one doubt our staying power. * * * Together with our friends and allies, ships of the United States Navy are today patrolling Mideast waters. They've already intercepted more than 700 ships to enforce the sanctions. Three regional leaders I spoke with just yesterday told me that these sanctions are working. Iraq is feeling the heat. * * * They are cut off from world trade, unable to sell their oil. And only a tiny fraction of goods get through. * * * I cannot predict just how long it will take to convince Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. Sanctions will take time to have their full intended effect.

Thus speaks the President of the United States.

On October 29, in San Francisco, he said:

And I would hope that the economic sanctions * * * will convince him that he should, without conditions, get out of Kuwait.

Well, as reported in the Washington Post on December 7, 1990, in Latin America the President said:

I've not been one who has been convinced that sanctions alone would bring him to his senses.

Well, no wonder the people of America are confused. Here is the President saying time and time again that we should have patience, moral leadership, economic sanctions to show a new

world order for collective security with a mission that would bind together to assure that a bully like Saddam Hussein cannot succeed. Not by unleashing the dogs of war, but by isolating, sanctioning, ensuring that his economy cannot function.

There are some even today who say that Saddam has already won. Quite to the contrary, he is losing every day. Recent estimates are that Saddam Hussein and Iraq are losing somewhere in the neighborhood of \$70 million a day in lost oil revenues that they cannot sell. They cannot use any of their occupied Kuwaiti ports. So he has gained nothing and he is losing every day. I think that we should have patience, as the President first said.

Or, as another one of the my distinguished colleagues said the other day, which is better: Do we want to wait a year and a half, perhaps, for sanctions to really have their effect, or to perhaps lose 20,000 American lives in a war that would take place early this year?

So all of this has happened since we adjourned in October. Immediately after the election, the President announced that we were going to double the troop strength to almost 400,000. After the election. Then the January 15 deadline was brought by the President. Secretary Baker went around the world, getting all the nations to support the vote in the U.N. Security Council.

This Senator wonders, and I wonder aloud, what Secretary Baker promised all these nations to get them to vote for this resolution? I would note for the record that the day after the United Nations vote when China abstained—they could have vetoed the resolution, but China abstained—the day after, the Chinese Foreign Minister had a meeting with the President at the White House. After what happened in the Tiananmen Square last year, what did Secretary Baker promise China to get them to abstain the Security Council? I think that is a question that needs to be answered.

So these are not normal times. These are not the times when we can close our doors and go home. It is time for us to stand up and be counted.

January 23 is an arbitrary date—it is not written in the Constitution that we have to come back January 23—just like January 15 is an arbitrary date. It is not written in stone anywhere. So now is the time for us to take this up.

Again, as I said earlier, my resolution does not get to the merits of military action. I have been talking about the merits early of using military force here because I think they are intertwined with the constitutional issue. I do not think you can talk about one without also talking about the other.

But the first step is to reaffirm the constitutional obligations of Congress. I use my arguments on sanctions to buttress my belief that we have to have

a vote on this prior to any kind of military action in the Mideast.

We have been told time and time again by Secretary Baker that the coalition may fall apart if we do not act. We do not know if we can hold them together. Is that what we have come to as a nation? That we can no longer lead by moral force, by persuasion, economically or by example, but the only way we can lead in the world is by brute military force? Is that what we have come to as a country? I think that is an unfortunate statement for our Secretary of State; that we cannot lead the free world for 1 year or a year and a half or 2 years to keep the sanctions on, and that the only way we can lead is through brute military force. I think that is unbecoming of the Secretary of State. And I do not believe that our country has come to that. I still believe America can lead by example and persuasion and moral force and economically in the world community today. And yes, like the President, I want a new world order, one of collective security, under the auspices of the United Nations.

In August, I was somewhat taken to task by members of the administration for objecting to some of the actions that were taking place in August. At that time, I stated quite clearly that the President should have followed the lead of Dwight Eisenhower when, in 1958, President Eisenhower on one day sent 15,000 troops into Lebanon. Three days later, he went before the United Nations and asked the United Nations to take over that peacekeeping force so we could withdraw our troops. The United Nations did it. That is the kind of example of leadership we need in the White House. It is the kind of example we need of collective security in a new world order.

I stated that at the time President Bush said that, he had something President Eisenhower did not have going for him in 1958; we have Gorbachev on our side. What would that have said to the world community if both Gorbachev and Bush had gone to the United Nations and together had said, "We stopped Saddam Hussein from going any further; now it is up to the United Nations to take over that operation"? We would supply troops. So would other member nations. And then the United Nations could assess member nations for the cost of that operation. That should have been the proper course of action for us to take, not to go it alone.

Mr. SIMON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I will yield to my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. I thank my friend and I commend him for urging restraint on the part of the administration. I would like to just interject 1 minute to underscore what my colleague from Iowa has said.

Seven of us, who went to the Middle East under the leadership of Senator MITCHELL, met with President Bush the day that we got back, about 2 weeks ago, and at the end of a meeting of more than an hour with President Bush, he said: Let me summarize by saying if we use military force, we can make the United Nations really meaningful for the first time and really establish world order.

And I said: Mr. President, I know you meant to close with that, but can I have 30 additional seconds? And he said yes.

I said: Mr. President, you know, if Libya invades Chad, or Mozambique invades Malawi, neither of which I think is going to happen, but if those things were to happen, we are not going to send 400,000 troops. We might and probably would vote sanctions.

If we can make sanctions stick, then we have found a mechanism to really establish stability in the world, not the use of military might, which may or may not be used. I think that underscores what my colleagues from Iowa has said, that restraint ought to be used in this kind of situation, and I commend him.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank my friend from Illinois for his comments. He has been a long-time leader in bringing sane and rational thinking to this body, and especially as it concerns the situation in the Mideast.

Let me close my comments by again saying that we must, as a body, address this constitutional issue. We can no longer shun our responsibilities under the Constitution. Each Senator, each Congressman must stand up and be counted on this issue.

Last, as to the merits of the case itself, as someone who spent a good deal of time in the military, somewhat a student of past military actions of this country and others, it seems to me there is always one principle that a nation should follow if, in fact, it is going to war: Strike the enemy when he is the weakest, not when he is the strongest. We can keep sanctions on for a year and a half or two, until he uses his spare parts and he cannot fly his jet aircraft and his tank commanders cannot get replacement parts for his tanks. If, and I use the word if, if at that time the sanctions are not working, and we then must resort to force, it would seem to me that is when he will be the weakest. Now he is the strongest.

So let the sanctions work and let this body vote up or down, before the first bullet flies, as to whether or not we are going to permit the President to initiate the war or whether we are going to have that responsibility ourselves.

I suppose if the Congress wants to give it up, perhaps they can give it up, but I think that would be shunning the oath of office that we stood in the well

yesterday and took, to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WIRTH). The Senator from Washington. Mr. ADAMS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I joined with my colleague, Senator HARKIN, yesterday in objecting to a procedure that would have potentially prevented debate and hopefully congressional vote on the war that may occur in the Middle East on January 15.

This was not something that should have been a surprise to anyone that this would occur, because on November 29, when the Congress was out of session, I, as a single Senator from the State of Washington, was so upset with the actions of the President, taken, as pointed out by my colleague from Iowa, when the Congress was at recess and after the election, to change the character of the whole operation in the Middle East from a defensive, United Nations sanctioned action to an escalation of "let us use force," that I appeared, made a public statement opposing the use of force, and put in the RECORD for the public to see at that time my exchange of letters with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and with the majority leader, stating that I did not believe force should be used. I put forth the letters that I had written prior to our adjournment saying that if we adjourn sine die, I am concerned that this President may change his mind and may move to an operation that involves force so we should be in a position to call ourselves back; and second, there should be a consulting.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that I have printed in the RECORD both my statement I made on November 29 and the attached letters to and from the majority leader and the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BROCK ADAMS' STATEMENT ON UPCOMING U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL VOTE CONCERNING USE OF FORCE IN THE PERSIAN GULF

The United Nations Security Council will vote this afternoon on the Administration's proposal to authorize the use of force in the Persian Gulf.

This is an abrupt change in U.S. policy since Congress adjourned. It represents a dramatic shift from a policy of defense, deterrence, and reliance on U.N.-imposed economic sanctions to a call for U.N.-support for a U.S.-led war against Saddam Hussein—a war that would cost countless American casualties and billions of dollars.

I am here today to announce that this United States Senator is opposed to President Bush's new offensive policy provoked by the rapid escalation in the number of U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf.

I will do all in my power to oppose the U.S. going to war in the Persian Gulf.

I have supported our original policy goals in the Gulf. I support the defense of Saudi Arabia, and I condemn the invasion and subsequent destruction of Kuwait, but I do not believe the solution is an invasion by U.S. forces, which would cost thousands of lives and lay the seeds for long-term enmity between the United States and the Arab world.

The new world order should not resort to old-world tactics. There will be many more regional conflicts in the next 40 years, and the U.S. should not inaugurate this new era by serving as the world's police or by being a muscleman for other nations.

If the U.N. wants to use force in the Gulf, it should be with multilateral forces. The U.S. should secure a resolution under Article 43 of the U.N. Charter that would create a true multilateral force, with all countries involved bearing their fair share, under the U.N. military staff committee.

Today's action, however, only ensures multilateral support for American military action, which neither the American people nor the Congress have been asked to support.

I am only one, a single member of the United States Senate, but perhaps what I have said today will cause others harboring doubts to speak their minds. We are on a reckless course in the Persian Gulf, and the time to change course is now.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, November 30, 1990.

Hon. THOMAS FOLEY,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I commend your strong statements in defense of the division of the constitutional powers between Congress and the President.

I know you will be meeting today with the President and I hope you will be able to indicate to him that many of our colleagues oppose his dramatic shift from a defensive policy that relies on UN-endorsed sanctions to one of sending thousands of additional U.S. troops prepared for a military offensive in the Gulf. I firmly believe that the earlier defensive policy enjoys widespread popular and Congressional support. The offensive policy that has brought us to the brink of war does not.

Yesterday, I announced my opposition to President Bush's new offensive policy and to the U.S. going to war in the Persian Gulf. For your information, I am enclosing a copy of that statement.

I am deeply concerned that yesterday's UN resolution, however historic, only ensures multilateral support for a U.S. military effort, which will cause the loss of thousands of lives and cost billions of dollars. Instead, the President should seek approval of a true multilateral peacekeeping force as outlined in Articles 43 and 46 of the UN Charter. These Articles provide for the creation of a UN multilateral force by the Security Council and under the control of the UN Military Staff Committee.

I appreciate your decisions to create a Congressional Consultative Group and to incorporate into the *sine die* resolution a provision giving the Congressional leadership authority to call a special session while Congress is adjourned. As you know from my previous letters, I support both actions. However, I agree with your decision not to call Congress back into session before the 102nd Congress convenes in January.

I know that others in the House and Senate harbor similar doubts about the recent deployment. I hope that they will join me in

voicing their concerns so that a war in the Gulf can be avoided.

With best regards,

BROCK ADAMS.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, November 30, 1990.

Hon. GEORGE MITCHELL,

Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I commend your strong statements in defense of the division of the constitutional powers between Congress and the President.

I know you will be meeting today with the President and I hope you will be able to indicate to him that many of our colleagues oppose his dramatic shift from a defensive policy that relies on UN-endorsed sanctions to one of sending thousands of additional U.S. troops prepared for a military offensive in the Gulf. I firmly believe that the earlier defensive policy enjoys widespread popular and Congressional support. The offensive policy that has brought us to the brink of war does not.

Yesterday, I announced my opposition to President Bush's new offensive policy and to the U.S. going to war in the Persian Gulf. For your information, I am enclosing a copy of that statement.

I am deeply concerned that yesterday's UN resolution, however historic, only ensures multilateral support for a U.S. military effort, which will cause the loss of thousands of lives and cost billions of dollars. Instead, the President should seek approval of a true multinational peacekeeping force as outlined in Articles 43 and 46 of the UN Charter. These Articles provide for the creation of a UN multilateral force by the Security Council and under the control of the UN Military Staff Committee.

I appreciate your decisions to create a Congressional Consultative Group and to incorporate into the *sine die* resolution a provision giving the Congressional leadership authority to call a special session while Congress is adjourned. As you know from my previous letters, I support both actions. However, I agree with your decision not to call Congress back into session before the 102d Congress convenes in January.

I know that others in the House and Senate harbor similar doubts about the recent deployment. I hope that they will join me in voicing their concerns so that a war in the Gulf can be avoided.

With best regards,

BROCK ADAMS.

U.S. SENATE,

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,

Washington, DC, November 1, 1990.

Hon. BROCK ADAMS,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, DC.

DEAR BROCK: This is in response to your letters of October 5 and October 10. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts with me on the Persian Gulf.

I spoke to the Majority Leader on a few occasions concerning the adjournment of Congress at a time when U.S. forces are deployed in the Persian Gulf.

I believe that Senator Mitchell's action, taken in conjunction with Speaker Foley, to designate a joint bipartisan leadership group for consultations with the President on developments in the Persian Gulf while Congress is not in session and to provide in the concurrent resolution of adjournment for the Majority Leader and Speaker of the House to recall the Congress, are appropriate ways to deal with the issue.

Thanks again for sharing your thoughts on this important matter.

Sincerely,

SAM NUNN.

Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, October 10, 1990.

Hon. SAM NUNN,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, DC.

DEAR SAM: As you know, I have been very concerned that Congress faces a *sine die* adjournment in October with the grave possibility that hostilities will occur in the Persian Gulf during adjournment.

At a meeting last week with the Majority Leader, you and I suggested a Congressional Consulting Group be established by concurrent resolution to meet with the President on a continuing basis. This is presently pending in the Rules Committee. I have asked Senator Ford for his help in moving this from Committee to the Floor.

A second problem that was discussed with the Leader in a meeting last week was a form of Resolution if actions in the Persian Gulf move from the present defensive posture to offensive action involving hostilities. I have taken portions of the original Resolution that you and Senators Byrd, Warner, and Mitchell proposed last year and Senator Biden's extensive work and that of staff, to craft a form of Resolution that would not be connected to the War Powers Act. That Act would remain as it is. I am enclosing a copy of this Resolution and I have asked the Majority Leader to call us together at the earliest possible date to be certain a form of Resolution is available during recess, *sine die*, or that Congress reserve the power to reconvene in case of war.

I hope I will hear from you.

Sincerely,

BROCK ADAMS.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, October 25, 1990.

Hon. GEORGE J. MITCHELL,

Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: Thank you for your letter of October 23, 1990, regarding your plans, with Speaker Foley, to form a bipartisan leadership consultative group.

The formation of this group, along with a concurrent adjournment resolution which will allow Congress to be called back into session in the event of hostilities, is indeed a first step to ensuring that Congress exercise its constitutional authority with respect to the situation in the Persian Gulf.

It is my hope that we can work together to further strengthen Congress' war making powers as provided by the constitution. On this point, I believe that if hostilities were to occur, the consultative group which you are creating should be empowered to introduce a resolution authorizing the continued commitment of U.S. armed forces in such hostilities. This resolution should be considered under expedited procedures such as a 4(a)(1) resolution of the War Powers Act.

I intend, before we adjourn, to put in the RECORD, a form of a resolution which could be used to carry out these recommendations. I deeply appreciate what you have done and I look forward to continuing our joint efforts on this very important matter.

Sincerely,

BROCK ADAMS.

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, DC, October 23, 1990.

Hon. BROCK ADAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BROCK: I greatly value your views about the importance of Executive consultation with Congress regarding any decisions that might lead to war, particularly in the context of the approaching recess and the situation in the Persian Gulf.

Your advice has helped prompt Speaker Foley and me to invite the bipartisan leadership and the chairmen and ranking members of the relevant committees to participate in a consultative group for this purpose. I will urge the President to consult with this group, while recognizing that such a group cannot substitute for the whole of Congress.

In this regard, Speaker Foley and I will also ensure that the concurrent adjournment resolution provides that, in consultation with Mr. Michel and Senator Dole, we will be able to recall the Congress to Washington as necessary.

I hope that you will consider these actions a step forward in helping to ensure that Congress is able to exercise its constitutional authority with respect to war powers.

You and your resolution regarding consultation have played a key role in this regard. I thank you for your counsel and support on this extremely important issue.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. MITCHELL.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, October 10, 1990.

Hon. GEORGE MITCHELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: As you know, many of us have expressed our views about the situation in Iraq and the necessity of Congressional involvement. Of special concern is the fact that, once we adjourn sine die, the only way we could be called back, should military action occur, is for the President to call an emergency session. This concern is especially acute in light of recent press reports of contemplated military action.

Therefore, we are writing to express our belief that, when the Congress passes a concurrent resolution of adjournment sine die, language should be included reserving the right of our Senate and House leadership to call us back into session prior to the commencement of the 102nd Congress. In reviewing precedents established in previous sessions of Congress, we have found that Congress has frequently adjourned sine die with a call-back provision. For example, this was done in 1983 due to the situation then existing in Lebanon.

Our recent concurrent resolution expressing support for the President's efforts thus far made it clear that in the event of imminent hostilities or a contemplated military effort against Iraq by the United States, the President remains obliged to operate within constitutional and legislative processes. To assure that we are in a position to discharge those constitutional responsibilities allocated to the legislative branch, we believe that our leadership in both the Senate and House need to reserve the option of reassembling without having to await Presidential action in reconvening Congress.

We, therefore, respectfully request that you put forth an adjournment resolution which contains language similar to the following:

"Sec. . The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore

of the Senate, or the Majority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it."

We would be most willing to discuss this matter with you personally should you so desire.

Sincerely,

BROCK ADAMS.
TERRY SANFORD.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I take the floor today because we have now given our consent to a unanimous-consent agreement that attempts, I hope, to provide for debate and for congressional action before the bullets fly and the bombs fall. If we do not take congressional action prior to an independent action by the President, the whole character of the vote changes. Members that might vote on the merits against using force and, instead, continuing the use of sanctions and continuing the use of the U.N. operation, will be faced with the argument in their districts and their States, House and Senate, that you are not supporting our boys overseas; that you are not supporting a policy that has already been put in to effect.

The time for decision is now. That is why Senator HARKIN and myself introduced the resolution yesterday, or attempted to, I should say, put in the resolution, that just simply states that the President must come to the Congress and obtain authorization before the use of force in the Middle East.

A second purpose I have for taking the floor today is that, if the unanimous-consent agreement is agreed to, it provides that we can introduce the joint resolution which states what the Congress feels, its belief with regard to the fact that the President must come to the Congress to obtain authorization before going to war or using force.

But on January 14, if we debate this issue, on that date, I will reintroduce Senate Joint Resolution 386. One of the reasons I put into the RECORD the statement I made on November 29 was that prior to adjourning, I put in Senate Joint Resolution 385 and Senate Joint Resolution 386 which state that the President, as a matter of law, must come to the Congress and provide for expedited proceedings for resolution.

Let me tell you what my concern is, where it comes from, and the concern of Senator HARKIN, that we have time for debate and resolution of the issue. Seven times during the reflagging of Kuwaiti vessels, when we were then on the other side of the Saddam Hussein-Kuwait operation as opposed to Iran, after we had taken hostilities, we tried to bring up the war powers resolution to say that the President was authorized to take certain actions.

We were not even trying to prevent the actions. We were trying to say there should be an authorization but there is a limitation on it of this

amount of time, and this is the authorization that is required for money to spent. This was filibustered. This was filibustered to an extent that we could not even bring it to a final conclusion.

My concern, as I stand here today, is that the same thing will occur to any resolution that we attempt to bring up and we attempt to pass prior to the January 15 date.

We have received, to say the least, confused signals as to what January 15 means. I have been criticized by others for saying that January 15 has been made into a potential war date, or that the bombs may fall on that day. I did not set January 15. No Member of Congress set January 15. This was proposed by the administration and has been accepted by the administration as its own date when it could go to the United Nations, obtain authorization for the use of force, and that it would operate on that date.

But I would state to the Members very clearly again, as I did yesterday, that the U.N. resolution does not authorize the President to go to war. It does not authorize the President to use force that is the equivalent of going to war. That must be authorized under the charter, sections 41, 43, and 46, by the individual countries. This is not at this point an authorization by the United Nations for the use of a U.N. force as a U.N. force. It authorizes nations individually to go.

So I will introduce Senate Joint Resolution 386 on the 14th, which provides for expedited proceedings. We need those expedited proceedings. The only reason we ever tried to use the War Powers Act is because it could cut off a filibuster and it would allow the Congress to work its will.

I do not want to see the Congress prevented from working its will on this critical, crucial issue that faces this Nation of whether or not we will be at war in the Middle East.

So that resolution will be introduced on the 14th.

But today, if this goes through, we will introduce, Senator HARKIN and myself, a Senate resolution that fits the unanimous-consent request that requires and states that it is the sense certainly of this Congress that the Constitution of the United States vests all powers to declare war in the Congress of the United States and any offensive action taken against Iraq by the United States must be pursuant to an explicit authorization by Congress before such action may be initiated.

In a moment, I will speak to the policy, but first, so there be no question in anybody's mind, I am appalled when I hear administration officials state that the President can issue an order and that we can use force, in effect, go to war with Iraq, without constitutional approval.

Roger Sherman of Connecticut, who in 1776 had been one of the five mem-

bers to write the Declaration of Independence, and who, Thomas Jefferson observed, as we said in the New Yorker in its issue of December 31, 1990, on pages 25 and 26:

*** "never said a foolish thing in his life"), now agreed that "the Executive should be able to repel and not to commence war." Madison reported at this point that Mr. Gerry said he "never expected to hear in a republic a motion to empower the Executive alone to declare war," and that George Mason of Virginia, "was against giving the power of war to the Executive, because not safely to be trusted with it." The Madison-Gerry proposal passed, eight states to one. The issue could hardly have been more clearly settled.

The eighty-five Federalist Papers, published, mostly in the New York press, during the ensuring fall, winter, and spring, further manifested the Founding Fathers' determination that the American President would not have the power of the British king to wage war at his pleasure. Absolute monarchs often make war "for purposes and objects merely personal," John Jay wrote in Paper No. 4. In Paper No. 69 Hamilton wrote that the military authority of the President would be "much inferior" to that of the British king, because the king declared war and raised and regulated the military, "all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature"—that is, would belong to Congress. None of the thirteen states wanted an elective king for a President, either.

This states very well the historical perspective. There is no question about it. The Congress can abdicate. I am fearful that Congress will abdicate. I am fearful it will be prevented from working its will.

We should vote on whether or not this Nation goes to war, whether or not there shall be casualties, whether or not the Treasury shall be emptied again for purposes of war. All of us who supported, and we did support and we give great credit to the President for establishing a policy of stopping Saddam Hussein. We stopped him. Sanctions were put in place. Diplomacy was used by this administration up to the time of the election, and we agreed with it, and supported it, and appropriated money for it, and we still support that position. These sanctions should be given a chance to work. The change to an offensive posture, the calling of Reserves, the bringing over of additional troops, has boxed the Nation into a position where now we have to vote on this to prevent an unwise decision.

Let me comment just briefly on the policy itself of using force at this time. My colleague, Senator HARKIN, mentioned one reason, which is weaken your enemy if you are going to use force and strike him at his weakest. But there are far greater issues involved which have not been debated on the floor of the Senate yet and they need not only to be debated but resolved, voted upon.

Let me mention, first, that we had no commitment that I have been able to

ascertain and, on the contrary, public comments that went the other way as to whether or not our Arab allies would fight an offensive war. It is essential that our Arab allies stay with us and that this not be a war that becomes one between West versus East or West versus the Arab nations.

These coalition partners are content and are supportive of the policy we have now. We have not had assurance that they will be supportive if we go into an offensive war, which means the invasion of Kuwait and the potential invasion of Iraq.

A second thing, and the question that should always be asked in a war is what if you win the war? Are we going to occupy Baghdad? Are we going to occupy Kuwait? What is going to be our posture if we have conducted military operations, and after these military operations are over, we have had some degree of success?

I have never heard a discussion of that by the administration.

I know pretty well what will happen if the sanctions work and we squeeze this Nation and either have the overthrow of Saddam Hussein or we weaken him and his nation to a point where they are no longer a threat. That result will be an internalized result and one that we can maintain enforcement and also maintain peace in that region.

A third point: One of the reasons many of us were involved in the debates in the Iran-Iraq war and now involved in this debate is that the United States has had a presence in the Persian Gulf for 40 years. We will probably have to have a presence in the Persian Gulf for another period of time. We have protected the oil supplies that were necessary from Saudi Arabia, the Emirates, elsewhere.

We have the hostages now out of those countries. We have stopped further aggression. We have put in place sanctions to prevent Saddam Hussein from conducting his country's operations as he would like. And those sanctions should be given a chance to work. If we were to pull down our troops to a point where we could rotate them now, we can sustain a presence there for a long time.

We had a presence in Europe for 40 years. We still have a presence in Japan. We still have a presence in Korea. This Nation is capable of sustaining long-term efforts if those long-term efforts have the support of the people, the votes of the Congress, and the executive branch with a clearly stated policy of why we are doing it. That is possible. But it is not possible to sustain—and this has been stated by our military people, it has been stated by many others—it is not possible to sustain 500,000 troops or an offensive force—and I will try to quote as accurately as I can but I will paraphrase what the administration is saying—a

massive offensive force so they can win this war in 2 or 3 days.

I have heard about wars being won in 2 or 3 days before. You have entrenched troops on the border. Are you going to take territory? How much are you going to take? Are you going to stop at the Iraqi border? Are you going to fight a land war? Are you going to fight an air war?

All of these things are left clouded. That is why the Congress has to step up to its responsibility. That is why I had filed before Senate Joint Resolution 386 which sets up a system for the Congress to vote on what can be done with force, how much, and a way of getting to a final vote and resolution.

I hope that we start a debate prior to the 14th. It may or may not occur. I hope that if that does not occur, we have an agreement on a date and time of voting before hostilities occur. These are matters that were underlying the debate yesterday.

The time of voting on whether or not to take offensive action is prior to the action taking place. Those of us who have been on this floor fighting against the use of force for a number of policy reasons, and giving sanctions a chance to work, fought the process request yesterday because if we start this debate too late and the President takes action as he seems to feel he has the power to do so and those troops move, the debate will be entirely different than the debate, if we have it, prior to that time. This is a time for each Senator to vote his or her conscience but to vote it in an informed fashion after a very long debate.

When I say "long," I do not mean days of time. I mean a statement of position and consideration of options so that we know as a nation whether or not blood is to be spilled and whether or not the Treasury is to be emptied for a war when we had a policy in place—and have at the present time—that can and will work. It has not been given a chance to work.

I hope that we will have the debate, we will have the resolution of this issue, I have placed in the RECORD the items that I did to show that we have given not only ample information as this has been growing to our leaders and to the others who have been involved in negotiations, we have tried to raise this issue and have every briefing that has come up.

I do not question anyone's good faith in America as they debate this issue, but I do question deeply the judgment that is being exercised and the points of time when we will be making this decision because we are at a very critical point in our Nation's history. We have all talked that this is a new era, that the Soviet Union has a different position in the world than it did before and that this is our chance to make the United Nations work. Let us give it a chance to work, not be hasty in war.

I would close by saying our attention is devoted to this but a great danger exists also with all the events in the Soviet Union, the danger of the nuclear weapons that are there which are real, the danger of instability, the danger of a government taking over that is hostile, or the danger of the country fragmenting and these nuclear sites being in the hands of those who are not responsible. But we are not even able to approach that at this moment because the President is talking war in an area where we do not need war and where we are capable of sustaining our presence and sustaining the presence of our allies, because if our allies are not willing to stay with sanctions, which they have indicated they are, how far will they go in war?

Remember, it is always easy to vote to send somebody else's children, somebody else's money, and so nations voting in the United Nations have recognized this and they have not asked us to do it. We asked them to approve our doing it. I do not think we should do that. I do not think threats in the Arab world are credible; then you have to move to action. Our threat is not the way to proceed. It does not lead to the result we want. The squeezing with the sanctions, the naval blockade, the stopping of the oil, the isolation of the society is a way that can get us the result we want.

So those who would unleash the dogs of war I think should consider very carefully what is the interests of the United States? Why do we benefit from this as a nation? Can we afford this as a nation? Should we have this as a nation? This decision should be made in these Halls.

This Senator is prepared to vote on any resolution anytime from now on. I pray I will have an opportunity to vote on it prior to the bombs falling.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I compliment my colleague from the State of Washington for an excellent statement. I thank him for working together on this resolution. We both share common goals and interests in this.

Senator ADAMS has been one of the most outspoken and forceful leaders in this body and previously when I served with him in the House of Representatives, in making sure that Congress exercises its constitutional—I will not say prerogative but I will say constitutional mandate.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, I am delighted to yield.

Mr. ADAMS. It is a pleasure to work with the Senator from Iowa. Many Members of this body may not know, but this is a naval fighter pilot. This is a person who has been in war. I have always found, when we were fighting to stop the Vietnam war, and he joined with me in that, those who have been in combat are the leading people to

urge caution in unleashing the dogs of war. I know the Senator will remember when we took the Bronz and Silver Star members from World War II and from the Vietnam war and from the Korean War into the well of the House. That was the first time we began to roll back the tide in Vietnam.

So I compliment the Senator. It is a pleasure to work with him. I hope and pray that we can avoid a disaster for this country. I appreciate his leadership.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator. I hope we can avoid the calamity like we had in Vietnam. It was not until maybe 40,000 of our finest young men came home in body bags that we finally started talking about what we were doing. Let us not let that happen again. Let us debate and discuss this right now.

I find it unusual at best that here we are on January 4, 11 days from this deadline dated January 15, and the Senator from Washington and this Senator are the only two on the Senate floor discussing this issue.

Beyond discussing, I think we ought to reach some kind of resolution on this and have a vote. As I said, it is time for Senators to stand up and be counted.

The central question comes down to this: Do you support the President over the Constitution, or do you support the Constitution over the President?

Presidents come and go. Some are good, and some are bad. Some lead and some do not. But the Constitution of the United States endures, and it lasts, the finest document ever drafted to steer a ship of state, not for a year or two or a decade, but for centuries. What has gone before for the last 200 years should last for another 200 and 200 beyond that, because the Constitution of the United States embodies within it an understanding of human nature, how human beings interact with one another, the result of a millenia of wars, persecutions, of despots and kings leading their people into various and sundry wars and conflicts. The Framers of the Constitution understood human nature, and what it means to balance the power, balance those conflicts.

We have been drifting for far too long in this country with too much power in the executive branch. It is now time for us to stand up and say the Constitution now, the Constitution forever, first and foremost the Constitution; not this President, not any President over the Constitution.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, let me thank our distinguished colleague from Iowa. I think it was very, very important on yesterday that he stood up and raised the question of the re-

sponsibility of this particular body, and that we just not callously come in, get everybody sworn for new terms of office, handle the politics, and disregard the problem.

Conscientiously, the distinguished Senator from Iowa could not stand for that, and the Senator from South Carolina could not stand for it. In fact, we have been saying that for a couple of months, ever since the President changed signals on us, waited until after the election, and then changed from defensive to offensive, set out a policy of committing GI's to combat in order to punish naked aggression. I think that is the target. It has been a changing target.

I thought we ought to get the Congress together and talk about this. The President got more bellicose, more strident, and we in turn became more silent.

I have to acknowledge there are Senators who perhaps have not worried as much as this Senator, have not had, let us say, as much time to spend on it. I was stuck to CNN during August. I was home politicking, going around the State, and I observed the change of policy here.

We just had the administration briefing yesterday. I just did not get a chance to ask the Secretary of State, "Where is April Glaspie?" They have hidden her. If you can find her, brother, you will get a top job offer at the Secret Service or the FBI or someplace.

But we just had a long background of history outlined last evening—the history of Kuwait, the history of Iraq, and the historical differences, not just geographical differences which existed ever since it was just a political decision by England and France at the end of World War I to cut her off from the former Ottoman Empire, and say, "this is Kuwait; you just handle your own affairs, and give us the oil."

We should also remember the more recent difference between Kuwait and Iraq when Kuwait went into that oil field, 95 percent located in the country of Iraq, and taking oil from it, as well as agreeing to pump oil on Iraq's behalf during the Iran-Iraq war and then requiring repayment.

Saudi Arabia also pumped oil on Iraq's behalf, but later forgave the debt. Saddam went to King Fahd, and the King said forget it; you have protected Arab integrity, and there is no charge. Saudi Arabia wrote off the oil they pumped on Iraq's behalf during the 8-year period of the war. But when Saddam went down to Kuwait and asked the same treatment, Kuwait sent a \$20 billion bill.

You had to end the territorial dispute, the economic dispute, and then of course the actual pressure of Iraq's buildup for invasion and the dispute that Iraq could have with the United States of America.

Incidentally, everybody knew Iraq was amassing troops. There has been a dispute as to whether we had intelligence or not. It can be stated unequivocally—and I have seen it now in the news—that the military intelligence was on target, even if other intelligence entities were not. Military intelligence foresaw an attack at that time by Iraq into Kuwait.

A key event during this buildup was that Saddam called in April Glaspie, the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq.

And when asked by Saddam on July 27 what is the United States' policy with regard to disputes between Iraq and Kuwait, Ambassador Glaspie's answer was that the United States takes no position on territorial disputes between Arab countries.

So given the green light by the United States on July 27, 5 days later Iraq invaded, on August 2. And so we promptly and fully debated on this floor; we met as soon as we came back after Labor Day. And we passed a resolution formally approving President Bush's action in coming to Saudi Arabia's defense and imposing sanctions. Of course, at the time, the President cautioned that sanctions could take 1 year to 2 years to work.

And so we virtually unanimously supported that. I voted to support the policy, and we went about our business. The American people hardly paid attention to it, other than that they knew some National Guard units were being called up. Then, after the general election, with the Congress gone, the President began to play the game. When I say play the game, I speak advisedly. It is quite obvious to this particular Senator that the President of the United States definitely had the authority to convene the Senate at that time. He could have done so if he wanted our advice and consent. But rather, he said, No, I do not need to fool with that crowd. I need to win over the U.N. crowd. If I can run around the world and bribe that particular group, then I will be in the driver's seat.

We gave Turkey higher textile quotas, we gave Syria and Lebanon. We gave Egypt a \$7 billion loan forgiveness. We gave Saudi Arabia our defense shield plus a windfall of anywhere from \$20 to \$30 billion in higher oil prices.

The President of the United States could forego this particular debate, if he said to the leadership: I will consult. War is a serious thing. Article I, section 8, clause 11, empowers the Congress to declare war, not the President, not the Pentagon; but it empowers the people's Government, to declare war. It is categorically clear in this instance, because there is no war now. We have been out there for 5 months, and no one has been killed in hostilities, even though hostilities are imminent.

So without a war and with the Constitution categorically clear, the President, if he really wanted us, could eas-

ily get us. And do not finesse this thing with: "We consulted with the leadership on the change of policy." It has been noted it was an 11th-hour telephone call to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator NUNN of Georgia, who was reached in a restaurant one Friday. That was the extent of the administration's consultations. The policy had been decided upon.

Yes, there had been briefings. They called us in. But that is not real consultations, because the name of the game is to play chicken with Saddam. And if they have to threaten him and play the game of chicken with Saddam, they have to play the game of chicken with the Congress. They cannot come home and say: "We are just bluffing him. We do not really intend to go to war." It has to be credible. In order to do that, they have been veritably intransigent and more and more bellicose in their particular stand: We shall attack, and right closely to, if not on the exact date, of January 15, which has been laid down.

And so it is, Mr. President, that the President does not want our advice. He, no doubt, understands that he could not get a nearly unanimous vote as occurred with the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, with uninhibited, unrestricted authority. He must have gotten that message when we debated the resolution that is now in force, approving the defense against Saddam by the imposition of sanctions.

I, for one, was very careful to make clear that our resolution supporting Bush's intervention in the gulf was not a replay of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. I talked at the time about "Arabizing" the conflict, because the entire body of history there is being disregarded.

We are in the most ironic position in regard to this particular issue that we have ever been in. I would be glad to flesh it out later. But the point is that Saddam could win by losing, and the United States could lose by winning.

Let me say, though, that the President does not want our advice, and he knows he cannot get in categorically, so he does not ask for it. And he knows as long as we go along with this particular charade, "Let us wait. They are going to talk now, and they might meet in Geneva, and they might do that and get down to the 15th."

And if the President orders an attack—incidentally, if he does order it, we will all be supporting it. I dissent strongly from the position of our distinguished colleague over on the House side, DICK GEPHARDT of Missouri, when he said we would cut off the funds. You will not find this Senator cutting off funds. In fact, I voted against cutting off funds in Vietnam. I am still angry about that outcome. I am still ready to fight it. I know I have lost that. But Vietnam teaches a lesson which can be

applied to this case. You cannot impose a culture through the barrel of a gun. We were looked upon as foreigners in Vietnam and we never succeeded in imposing our political culture. It was a tough lesson to learn.

In any event, put me down that if the President gives the order, while I think it is bad judgment to go and start a war on January 15, and I would advise against starting a war on January 15, if the President started a war here on January 4 or 5 or any other date, I would certainly support it from the standpoint of funding it.

We have only got one President. You have the troops committed, they are in the field. We have known now since November 8 that we had assumed an offensive posture, and the Congress now has an obligation to take a stand. I think the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. ADAMS] were proper in their insistence yesterday that we raise the question and start the debate. I have never heard it suggested, and I hope it would not be, that here the most deliberative body would be overstepping by deliberating on this issue.

I recall an instance in Finland some 19 years ago in the company of Senate leader Mike Mansfield. We were talking about bargaining chips in SALT I negotiations. We were counseled at that particular time by our experts in Helsinki: They said do not in Congress approve weapons systems strictly on the grounds that they might make good bargaining chips. Find out what the national defense needs and vote for it, and we will handle the consequences out here.

In a similar fashion, what we ought to be debating is what the policy should be or should not be, irrespective of crass political polls. While I agree with the Senator from Iowa that the Constitution is clear on this point, the debate should focus on whether it is the right policy, the right decision, the correct judgment or not. We are here to set policy and not play games. Meetings between the Secretary of State and Iraqi Foreign Minister Aziz may or may not happen. You are not going to outmaneuver and outfox or outchicken these Arab folks. They were raised in the bazaar. They are good poker players, let us put it in that sense. And the truth of the matter is that in a democracy you are not allowed the luxury of playing chicken. You have got the open media. Issues are openly aired, openly debated. The administration ought to be operating with the full support of the National Congress. I cannot imagine a President wanting to go to war without the support of the National Congress. As President he ought to be getting everyone to understand, appreciate, and support his policy. The President ought to seek that concurrence not just because the Constitution

requires it. It is not my purpose to try the President and win the constitutional debating point. I want to speak to the wisdom of this particular policy, whether it is smart, and the truth of the matter is that this rush to war is badly, badly mistaken.

I am firmly convinced that we have a pollster President. I say that advisedly. I have known one way or another both President Reagan and President Bush, both before they came to office. I always had the feeling, with due respect to President Reagan, that he was not as attuned and understanding of the issues as he should have been. He did not know government; he did not like government.

In contrast, I know George Bush respects government. He has held more distinguished positions of trust in this Government than any of us here on the Senate floor. He has been Ambassador at the United Nations and in China, CIA Director, Vice President, and Congressman. You will not find as varied a résumé. So he has been a part of government for many, many years. And he is smart.

The key moment was when Dukakis scared the death out of him in the summer of the 1988 campaign. Bush was 17 points ahead. He had to call in Jim Baker, who is more a fixer than a Secretary of State, and Jim Baker came in, straightened out that campaign, and taught Bush to do just what the polls said to do, and Bush won. I thought, having come out on top, we would get a President rather than a candidate. I am afraid, that he is still half a candidate, fixated on polls.

Our actions last year in Panama show the President's sensitivity to the polls.

In October 1989 when rebels had Noriega in their grasp, they checked with the White House, and the White House said, "No, let him go." And, of course, Noriega killed 100 of them. Incidentally, we ought to send him back down to Panama to be tried for murder and not worry about the complexities of a drug trial up here in the United States. We ought to say, "Oops, we made a mistake, we cannot give him his constitutional rights." Then give him his Panamanian rights, send him back to Panama and solve that case and quit playing around with it. I don't care whether we find him guilty or not guilty; the people in Panama are not going to accept it. We have wasted time and wasted money. Anyway, we had Noriega in our grasp in October. Then the polls went down, and we invaded Panama before Christmas. Bush will change to keep those polls up.

Incidentally, the President, respecting polls, should remember that poll taken in the General Assembly of the United Nations where, having gone into Panama, the United States was condemned for naked aggression by Ku-

wait, condemned by Kuwait for naked aggression.

I am afraid the President is reading those polls that show 2 to 1 approval of the way he is handling the gulf policy. One poll even asked, "Would you send your son to fight in the gulf on this particular cause?" And 54 percent according to that particular poll said "Yes."

Herein you see the limitations and the danger of polling. Anybody who believes that a majority of Americans are ready to send their sons to the gulf is whistling Dixie. It is outrageous nonsense. Ludicrous. You only have to look at the enlistments, which have dropped off significantly. That is the reality, not some political pollster asking abstract questions. As John Mitchell, as Attorney General, said, "Watch what we do, not what we say." That ought to be appended to every poll as a disclaimer as to limitations on how a poll is interpreted, because we constantly, as politicians, are experiencing election day upsets. The day after election day there is always an analysis of the upsets, and they all go back to the limits of polls, the misreading of polls. Now the polls say a majority of Americans favor a war with Iraq. On TV, we see the various administration officials running around Saudi Arabia asking the troops, "Are you all ready to fight?" Good Lord, I was a soldier for 3 years overseas. We would have given the same cheer.

I can tell you the best way to support our men and women in the gulf is to begin to talk sense to the American people and, when the administration counsels that we have to move now because we cannot keep up the heat, we cannot keep up the public interest, that is totally wrong. It is only now that people are becoming interested and seeking an understanding of this crisis.

As in a political campaign, you do not get the people's attention until October, and with January 15 nearing, you are just now getting the people's attention. And we all begin to wonder what the policy is. And heavens above, as was said in First Corinthians, chapter 14, verse 8, "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" We have had a very uncertain sound.

We all said after Vietnam, we are not going to make the same mistake again. Next time we go to war we are to go together—the President, the Congress, and the people—and we are going to make sure about it. And heavens above, we have had ample time to rally a united front here at home.

But the uncertain trumpet, Mr. President, goes back to earlier in the 1980's, when we did not give even diplomatic recognition of Iraq. My distinguished colleague and friend from Pennsylvania, when we debated cutting agricultural credits to Iraq in July,

said that he found Saddam a man of reason, someone who could be reasoned with.

We recognized Saddam and Iraq, and we began subsidizing Saddam and Iraq. We had subsidized food sales to Iraq over a 5-year period in excess of 5 billion bucks.

Some in the Congress, particularly our colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], said, wait a minute. Iraq is using this money to build up its tremendous military. And, by the way, Iraq gassed the Kurds. That is the kind of tyrant they have got there, gassing his own people. But we apparently did not have a policy then against gassing people, to punish gassing, only to punish aggression. So we did not say anything to the Iraqis then.

The Senator from New York led the fight to cut off agricultural credits. And the present administration fought that cutoff. They held it up on the House side until we came back from our August recess, and then of course with the invasion of Kuwait we finally got sanctions passed.

Consider the conversation that Saddam had with our Ambassador April Glaspie, when she gave the American green light to Saddam to, saying we would not take a position on the border dispute. And perhaps historically that was very correct. Because heavens above, the Arabs have got more differences there than we can imagine, going back centuries.

This particular Senator, almost 48 years ago, invaded Morocco. The United States Army took Morocco, we took Algeria, and we took Tunisia, and they have not had a truly free election there yet.

We Americans believe in human rights, freedom, free elections. The Arabs' belief is religion, and that you and I are the infidels. They do not have free elections, they have assassinations. Go down the list of countries, from Morocco, come right on round: Qadhafi, in Libya, he overthrew his predecessors, Mubarak in Egypt, fundamentalists killed his predecessor, Sadat. Same in Lebanon, in Syria. The King of Iraq was assassinated in 1958 and the man who overthrew him was himself assassinated 5 years later. King Hussein was a little boy when they killed his grandfather. They have assassinations, we have elections. Human rights, if a man steals an apple, they cut off his hand. They treat their camels better than their women. So let us not talk about human rights over there.

Therein, Mr. President, is the uncertain trumpet from our Commander in Chief. The administration took no position with respect to Iraq and Kuwait on July 27, but by August 4 we had retroactively defined Kuwait as a vital interest of the United States. Even then, Bush said we are only there to protect

Saudi Arabia and enforce sanctions along with the rest of the international community.

Then, of course, the signals changed intermittently through August and September. The first thing I heard was that our way of life is being threatened. I almost broke out laughing. The Emir and his many wives have nothing to do with the American way of life, I can tell you that.

The Kuwaitis' idea of resistance is to hire a big-bucks American public relations firm, Hill and Knowlton. Previously they had disregarded any kind of national defense, and now we hear how conscientiously they are studying how, after we liberate Kuwait, they are going to tough it out with two servants rather than three servants in Kuwait. Wonderful mission that we have out there.

But they were not sacrificing anybody. They cut and ran when Iraq invaded. In 48 hours they were gone. They did not have any national defense. They tweaked Iraq's nose, demanding debt repayment and pumping oil from a disputed field, but they didn't have the common sense to prepare to defend themselves. There is no military draft, incidentally, in Kuwait or Saudi Arabia.

So the first rationale was that our way of life was being threatened. And we know, of course, differently. Kuwait has a totally different way of life, a different culture. And I hasten to emphasize that you cannot impose an alien culture through the barrel of a gun. That is the lesson that we ought to be learning in the gulf crisis, because by winning a war we could lose the peace.

The next rationale for our involvement was that we were opposing naked aggression. Well, come now, come, really. Naked aggression is rampant around the world. We could figure 200 acts of naked aggressions, I would guess, in the last 20 years, naked aggressions—Cambodia, Afghanistan, Lebanon, you name it. Our response to naked aggression, I say to the Senator, in Afghanistan was to boycott the Olympics. Now we are going to sacrifice GI's.

Incidentally, I have two close nephews in the gulf area who differ with my views probably. One is a captain in the Marines. They are close family members. At Thanksgiving and Christmas dinner, we all eat together, though not this year. This year my wife turned the kitchen into a taste shop, and my job was to determine whether the cookies were good enough to send to the sailor, one of them, who is on board a ship, Jamey Baldwin or the other one, Capt. Claude Baldwin IV—we call him Bubba—a captain in the Marines.

I probably do not express their views because they are part of the gung-ho group of highly trained men and women. They are ready to go and do their job. That is what they signed up

for. They have a strong sense of duty and professionalism.

But, in any event, punish naked aggression? Just 5 weeks ago we had naked aggression in Chad. And we had naked aggression 6 weeks ago in Lebanon by Syria. They massacred some 750 Christians.

The Kuwaitis' PR crowd has been putting stories on the news about rape and about infants being yanked out of incubators by Iraqi soldiers; which I do not doubt is true. But I have not heard a report of total Kuwaitis killed. They have been very careful not to give us a body count. I doubt if Iraq killed as many as 750 defenseless civilians in Kuwait. But Syria did in Lebanon just 6 weeks ago. And we do not hear a peep about that naked aggression there.

Concerning the naked aggression rationale, the distinguished Republican leader on the floor said: Aggression, you spell it o-i-l. The Secretary of State says: No, it is j-o-b-s; it is jobs. None of those sold. The next thing they said: We are going to established a new world order.

I do not know what the rationale is today. None of these rationales persuade this particular Senator for the simple reason that, as I said, we are more likely to create a new world disorder.

When and if it comes to war, each side has selected targets. Our Commander in Chief has chosen his target. As the President himself said, "We going to kick ass." That is what he said. Iraq's commander in chief, Saddam Hussein, said he is going to kick Israel.

In our assault, to forego damage to Israel, I hope we would use our missiles to knock out every Iraqi missile that could possibly reach Israel. In fact, I just reminded the Vice President in a casual conversation, of the fact that when the INF Treaty was, under review, he and I argued the point that we should not do away with our GLCM's, ground-launched cruise missiles, armed with conventional weaponry.

We know that for 835 million bucks you can get one B-2 bomber. For the same \$835 million, you can get 835 conventional GLCM's, put them down in Turkey, let a Soviet auditor or monitor stand there and tell him, "This one is aimed at your Kremlin, this is aimed at your airfield, this is aimed at your communications," and so forth. You do not have to feed the missiles or anything else like that.

Then if an enemy had invaded through the Fulda Gap in Germany rather than ending the world with nuclear retaliation we could have hit a particular airfield or particular communications center, to stop them.

As JCS Chairman, Admiral Crowe said, we had to save cruise missiles for the Navy—the SLCM's. So when Navy Secretary Larry Garrett came to South Carolina last month, I said:

Why don't we put a conventional warhead on a Trident-based missile, a D-5 missile. We have them located in the Mediterranean. Just fire the D-5 overhead and let it land on Saddam. The Iraqis have radar to protect against planes, but they do not have anything to detect a D-5 coming out of the atmosphere.

The Secretary of Navy said he had not thought of that. I said get a conventional warhead off of one of your other missiles and put it on the D-5 that has the accuracy. We can avoid a bloody slugfest, avoid bragging as we did in Vietnam that the kill ratio, the casualty ratio, was 10 of them to 1 of us.

I told General Westmoreland in Saigon back in 1966:

General, you do not understand. The people back home are not going along with even that one dead American. You are not getting the good government award because the ratio is 10 to 1, the kind of ratio that you think is wonderful and evidently President Johnson thinks was wonderful.

In any event, if we hit Iraq's missiles and their airfields, even if they get their planes in the air, they will have no place to land. So I think we can pretty well handle that. But any flanking action into Iraq so that we can attack Iraq's occupation forces from their rear will break up our hollow alliance. We have been put on notice.

I have watched it carefully and I am speaking as carefully as I can. Turkey is not willing to attack Iraq. They have stated so, publicly, their Commander in Chief. There are no Turks down in Saudi Arabia. And they have no intention of attacking Iraq.

Likewise, Assad of Syria refuses to attack Iraq. He has gotten his billion bucks from Saudi Arabia, he has taken over Lebanon as a country.

Incidentally, in a contest to see who is the Arab Hitler, the countryside is full of candidates. More accurately Qadhafi would be No. 1 as Hitler; Assad is cast as Stalin; and Saddam Hussein is a poor little Mussolini. We have 500,000 to face down an Arab Mussolini out there.

So if we go into Iraq we would not have Assad, and we would not have Egypt. Cross-examine them carefully. The general said Egypt would not attack Iraq. They fired him. Then the speaker of the Parliament got shot and then Mubarak got tougher. More recently, Mubarak reaffirmed that Egypt is not there to attack Iraq, they are only there to defend Saudi Arabia.

Then what of Saudi Arabia? The Saudi Defense Minister, Prince Sultan, says: "There shall not be an attack on a brother Arab nation from the Holy Land of Islam."

Prince Bandar, the Saudi Ambassador to Washington controverts that. He runs up to the Hill to reassure us that the Defense Minister did not mean what he said. But that is what some Saudis are continuing to say. They do not necessarily adopt policy or follow

through rigorously as we do in a democratic country.

What this all points to is how by winning we could end up losing. So, constitutional issue aside, we are talking about the rightness, the correctness, the wisdom, the judgment of the decision. The United States could proceed under the posture now of the quick kill, with thousands and thousands of brother Arabs killed. We could go in with air power, take out their air force, then blanket bomb Iraqi troops with our B-52's.

Leave to one side the danger of Iraq blowing up Kuwait's oil wells and other huge potential complications. Instead, assure that all of it works well, we have won. I can tell my colleagues that every demagog, every leader, every terrorist in the Mideast will take heart because all they have to do after the smoke clears is say, "We have seen the infidel come over and kill thousands of our brothers for oil." And he will be telling the truth. And the world will believe it.

That brings us to the policy. When we urged, in September, coming back after the invasion: Let us put in an energy policy, what did they say? No.

The President, when asked about it, said "I am going to take my 1-mile-per-gallon cigarette boat, and I am going for a ride, and he went racing off." Message: Forget about conservation and energy policy.

(Mr. BAUCUS assumed the chair.)

Mr. HOLLINGS. The President's message: Forget about conservation in energy policy. I was an author of fuel economy in the 1970's standard, and more recently we got our distinguished leader, Senator BRYAN, to lead this fight and we put it out on the floor last year. The administration opposed it. With that one little initiative, we could save most of the output of Iraq and Kuwait, 2.5 million barrels a day, with that one little initiative.

We need an energy policy. But this crowd came to town in 1981 and they said, "forget it." We had a bipartisan energy independence policy. President Nixon, President Ford, President Carter. We had undergone all of those oil cutoffs. Kuwait cut us off in 1967; Kuwait cut us off in 1973; Kuwait and OPEC doubled the price in 1979. So we were getting a bipartisan energy independence policy.

President Reagan and Vice President Bush came to town and said, "forget it." We are going to appoint my friend from Charleston, Dr. Edwards, who now is doing an outstanding job at our medical university, but Dr. Edwards was told, "Secretary of Energy, get rid of your Department."

They were going to get rid of the Department of Education, get rid of the Department of Energy; let the market forces operate. The OPEC cartel, that crowd was running up the price, cutting off the oil and everything else, and

we were going to turn it over to monopolistic cartel forces. It was not any free market. But they said we did not need an energy policy.

Now, what we need do is, No. 1, to Arabize this Arab dispute before war breaks out. We killed 58,000 in Vietnam before we Vietnamized Vietnam. You cannot impose a culture through a barrel of a gun. They looked upon us as foreigners there. General Ridgeway and others said do not start a land war in Asia. We were told that in Korea. We were told that again in Vietnam. We have now Iraq. My geography book shows Iraq is in Asia. I always said education is in the second kick of a mule. We should have learned that by Vietnam. But there goes the third kick of a mule in Iraq, a land war in Asia.

And so we got to the point here of starting a land war because we did not have an energy policy when what we really need to do is Arabize those forces, and let the Arabs do the ground fighting if there is to be war. Specifically, rather than double from 200,000 to 400,000 the United States ground troops in Saudi Arabia, American GI's, we should have been drawing down from the 200,000 to 25,000 or 30,000 in that desert. We keep our Air Force; we keep our Navy; we keep our air power; we keep our missile power, and we say exactly what was said in July; if there is to be an attack by an Arab upon an Arab, it is their affair.

I cannot see them having free elections in Kuwait. I cannot see us occupying Iraq. I cannot see us leaving a vacuum there. There is a deep concern, of course. If you get rid of Saddam, it is possible that the Shiite majority in Iraq will join with Shiites in both Iran and those over in Syria and will begin taking over in the Mideast. Then we would really have a can of worms.

Rather than new world order, there would be new world disorder.

I think the President is mistaken. They say there are 200,000 Arab support forces. That is enough for a front line.

Remember, we only had 325,000 troops in Europe against Russia with all its missiles and everything else. Now we are getting 400,000 to 500,000 against little old Iraq, with only 17 million people, with what we ridicule as a very weak Air Force and no Navy to speak of. As to the Iraq Army, yes, the Republican Guards are good, but everything else is not. We have more forces deployed there than we had in Europe to stop the Soviets. We should draw down our ground forces and let the Arabs settle their differences. Because I do not care what we put in there, they are going to have differences once we are gone.

We are not going to impose a culture from the barrel of a gun. We are going to be infidels. You cannot change a culture except through an educational process, and the barrel of a gun is not an educational process. Do not make

Saddam a hero. The President started making him a hero when he personalized it. When he put this dispute on a personal basis and started calling him Hitler, the President of the United States gave him credibility. Anybody ought to know that.

Teddy Roosevelt said, "speak softly and carry a big stick." We have been speaking loudly and all the generals are coming out saying there is not enough stick; we are not ready yet. We cannot speak except in emotional terms of rape, torture, and Hitler.

Diplomatic and foreign policy experts would never talk in those terms. They should be counseling our President and not playing the game of bellicose rhetoric to charge up the people.

This fellow Saddam has used his military to attack two of his neighbors. That is exactly what we were condemned for by the General Assembly of, what?—the United Nations. In 1983, on the subject of Grenada, there were 100 votes against us. Kuwait voted to condemn us for naked aggression against our neighbor, Grenada. Then on December 29, just a little over a year ago, 1989, so-called naked aggression in Panama. And who voted against us? Kuwait. Is Kuwait worth the life of a GI? Not at all.

We cannot, frankly, adopt the policy of committing U.S. troops to combat aggression everywhere. That is a bad policy and a bad mistake. We can correct it with our advice and counsel, as a democratic republic form of government, by saying let us let those sanctions work.

In an article on the front page of the New York Times, day before yesterday, Patrick Tyler wrote from Baghdad that the sanctions are working. How? The ration cards given the Iraqis just a few months ago are already cut in half in value.

Iraq has not been paid for one drop of oil exports since August 2. That is a \$1.5 billion foreign reserve cutoff for 5 months, and the economic pressure continues. Let them continue to live with that.

We had no special relationship with Kuwait. There is no treaty or agreement, or inference thereof. They would not let us even land during times of crisis in the Iran-Iraq war. They would not let us dock a ship. They would not let us land a plane. And we said 3 years ago—the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, Senator BUMPERS, and others—the heck with Kuwait. They have not been our friend. They are certainly not a friend of democracy and freedom and human rights.

Our national security is not in any way threatened. For those who depend upon getting most of their oil from that part of the world, Germany and Japan, their national security could well be threatened, but they do not find any reason to get involved. And do not get worried about that little Ger-

man deployment that is to help us out with the Turks in NATO. But the Germans positioned the planes where they cannot get to Iraq. Look at the map. The Germans, the Japanese, they are not all boiled up. In fact, the Japanese are so clever. The Japanese are requiring their help to be in what would normally rejuvenate our economy here in the United States with an outburst of production of materiel to support the war. The Japanese are doing just that. They say, "We are going to help, but you are going to have to get Toyota jeeps." They are landing Toyota jeeps in Dhahran, and the Japanese economy is taking a boost. We are not producing any more vehicles or anything. We are just paying through the nose, running around with a tin cup. The Vice President was just at the mountaintop in Taif to see the Emir of Kuwait and beg for more money.

Three hundred thousand Kuwaits, said NBC, went down into Saudi Arabia. They said the most they could count was 7,000 that would volunteer to defend their homeland. I have been checking that, and they say the figure is nearer half that amount. The Kuwaits are in the hotels in Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Oman, Geneva, Saudi Arabia. They all have money. That is their defense, money and oil, and we are the ninnies running around wanting to commit our own troops here in this particular country for a misguided policy. It is not our way of life. It is not a new world order. We are not going to war for a new world order. You cannot force it with the military. You have to work through diplomacy. If it is naked aggression, it is a bad, bad mistake.

I do not want to see Saddam honored, rewarded, or whatever else it is. In a way, being a hawk, once I have this dispute Arabized, I would feel, by gosh, we will show them if they come across now, really rock them and sock them, and legitimately say to the eyes of the world: It was an Arab upon Arab fight, and we were fulfilling our commitments to the Arabs. At the moment—and on January 15—we are fulfilling our commitment to a very bad, defective, distorted policy of punishing naked aggression wherever and whenever it might occur on the globe.

If that is going to be our new, open-ended policy, the 82d Airborne is going to be kept busy the year round from now on out. We cannot afford such a policy politically. We cannot afford it financially. Everybody else is rebuilding and moving on. It is time we pull our horns back in, get this so-called peace dividend, which we should have, and start rebuilding America.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the mini-debate or discussion on the crisis in the Middle East, which began yesterday and continues today, has been primarily concerned with the wrong issue and very clearly is dealing with that wrong issue at the wrong time.

This Senator felt strongly, more than a month ago, that the Congress should have been called into a special session in December and should have debated not only the question of the President's authority, but the appropriateness of following up on United Nations resolutions designed for the liberation of Kuwait and the restoration of peace and security in the Persian Gulf.

At that time, the debate could have been conducted at length, and at some distance in time from the key date of January 15, 1991. No such session was called, either by the leadership of the Senate or the President, however, and we are faced now with a situation in the beginning of a new Congress, barely 10 days from that January 15 deadline.

Given the situation as it exists on the 4th day of January, I am convinced that the majority leader's position, so eloquently stated yesterday and again this morning, was absolutely correct. The congressional debate and discussion of this issue should take place after the visit of the Secretary of State to our allies in Europe and in the Near East and after he has had this final opportunity to offer discussions to the Foreign Minister of Iraq and perhaps to the President of Iraq, whether that offer of discussions is accepted or not.

Obviously, the kind of debate in which we have been engaged today, desultory as it has been, undercuts the position of the Secretary of State and the hopes for peace. When that discussion and debate take place—and it will certainly begin and perhaps may come to some vote before the 15th of this month—it is the belief of this Senator that it should be centered on the appropriate course of action in the Middle East, on the question of whether or not the President should be formally authorized by Congress to act in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations, and not on the internal question of the respective authority of the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to commit our armed services to some kind of action.

Arguments on both sides of that question have a great deal of merit. During the course of the last several weeks, I have read as widely as I possibly can on that constitutional issue. I believe that it is substantially unre-

solved, but that this Congress, quite obviously, will vote heavily in favor of involving itself in the process, at least as an abstract question.

The real question, however, should be whether or not this Congress ratifies the President's authority to follow up on the United Nations resolution and to liberate Kuwait and restore the prior status quo in the Persian Gulf by the use of military force, if necessary. That is a much more difficult question than the constitutional question, because it involves the future of this Nation, the future of this Nation's alliances, the future of this Nation's credibility, and the lives of young American men and women who are now stationed in the Middle East.

That is a much more difficult vote for each Member of this Congress today. But it is a vote which will be cast with the ultimate responsibility for its outcome, while an abstract debate over the constitutionality of the President's actions to this point or in the future will not have any such consequences.

I am convinced that the President of the United States should formally request the Congress of the United States to pass a resolution granting him, to the extent that it can do so, the same authority which this Nation has been granted by the United Nations itself. I am convinced that the President should ask that we discipline ourselves in such a fashion that we debate that resolution unamended, and that we and the House of Representatives vote on such a resolution in a timely fashion.

I believe that ultimately the Congress will grant that request and that almost to a certainty the President will be granted that authority. It is a chance, certainly, which the President takes, but it will be far better for him and for the Nation to know that the Congress will refuse him that support ahead of time than it would be to learn it later on.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that the President's course of action, beginning on August 2 of last year, has been almost impeccable. His ability to create the broadest coalition of powers with widely disparate interests since the end of World War II is an impressive achievement. The ability of our armed services to move halfway around the world and to position themselves in such a fashion as to offer us as great a chance of success as is ever possible to predict ahead of time, are immense achievements. The quality of peace and security, not only in the Middle East but in the world, will be greatly enhanced by our success and greatly harmed by any failure in the Middle East.

It is clear that the entire debate has moved to a different ground than was the case as recently as a month ago. In December, it was argued by some Members of Congress, myself not being

among them, that a policy of sanctions alone might ultimately result in the success of our efforts to cause Saddam Hussein to move out of Kuwait.

I do not believe at this point that it is possible seriously to make such an argument, given Saddam Hussein's history and given his willingness to sacrifice close to a million of his fellow citizens in an unproductive 8-year war with Iran, given his treatment of his own citizens, both Iraqi and Kurdish, and given every statement which he has made since August. It is simply not possible to make any kind of serious prediction that by a pure policy of sanctions, a policy which would require us to withdraw fully 50 percent of our troops from the Middle East and to keep the others there for an extended period of time, our policy will meet with any degree of success.

Certainly, if Saddam Hussein is unwilling to withdraw from Kuwait, faced with a credible prospect of the use of military force, which will cause him to lose armaments, territory, the lives of many of his citizens and perhaps his own position and his own life, clearly sanctions alone will never come to that ultimate end.

Bluntly, Mr. President, the alternatives to following the policies set out by the United Nations and by the President of the United States are highly unappetizing and far more likely to cause substantial loss of life not only in the Middle East but ultimately among Americans than are the prospects of following the President's desires.

The alternative of the President's proposals substantially are the prospects of losing. At worst, if we should back down at this point our allies in the Middle East will see the handwriting on the wall, will be forced to accept the primacy of Iraq in the Persian Gulf region, will ask us to leave and we will find an important part of the world and a vital natural resource almost totally under the control of a ruthless and unprincipled dictator.

At the best, under those circumstances, we may come to some kind of accommodation under which there is a partial withdrawal from Kuwait but which will simply disguise what will nevertheless be a long-term defeat and the necessity for those same countries to make the same kind of ultimate accommodation.

But the consequences will go far beyond the Middle East. If we are not willing to stay the course, in connection with the single most blatant example of aggression since the end of World War II, the sole circumstances in that period of time in which one sovereign nation, a member of the United Nations, has been invaded, the existence of which has been rubbed out by another member of the United Nations, if we cannot follow up on the most decisive action which the United Nations

has taken since the onset of the war in Korea, the United Nations will become a useless organization, and the lack of belief in America's seriousness or purposefulness will cause us to be abandoned by existing and potential friends around the world.

Are the chances significant under those circumstances, Mr. President, that we will have a peaceful decade, that there will not be other and more serious challenges in the Middle East or in other parts of the world, that there will not be a point at which we are forced to engage in conflict with fewer allies under far more difficult circumstances than those with which we are facing Iraq?

Mr. President, I submit that the answer to that question is that our lives and fortunes will be far greater at risk if we back down in this confrontation than if we follow the leadership of the President of the United States.

On the other hand, I think a great but true paradox is this: The greatest chances of a successful and peaceful result of a withdrawal on the part of Iraq from Kuwait will be derived from a credible threat for the use of our military force. That threat can be credible, of course, only if we, in fact, are willing to use force.

It is the firm belief of this Senator that, if during the course of the next week or 10 days Saddam Hussein is brought to the belief that he has no alternatives except for withdrawal or destruction, he will withdraw. He is not insane. He is not irrational. He is a great bluffer. He now has the rewards of aggression and he intends to keep them unless he is personally and in his own nation threatened with their violent removal.

Mr. President, I do believe that it is highly possible that the most likely result of a credible threat in the course of the last 24 or 48 hours before the expiration of our ultimatum that the President will not succeed in getting a total complete and unconditional withdrawal from Kuwait, but that Saddam Hussein may attempt to break the unity of the alliance by a partial such withdrawal keeping some of the oil fields or islands which are in question.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, it seems to me that we are faced with an entirely different challenge. If we can substantially restore Kuwait with that partial withdrawal, then this Senator at least would advocate the long-term retention of sanctions against Kuwait. We will have had some success at that point.

We should not call it a final victory and leave. We will almost certainly be required to protect Kuwait against further aggression. We will be able to do that with a much smaller investment in men, women, and materials than we have in the Middle East at the present time. But we can, and even within an alliance framework, see to it that Sad-

dam Hussein is unable to export his one valuable export, petroleum, until such time as he is willing to abide totally and completely with those U.N. resolutions.

The chances of a peaceful conclusion to this conflict, Mr. President, are far greater if we follow up and support the President than if we undercut his position looking for mythical diplomatic solutions or the success of a set of sanctions which are almost certainly doomed to failure.

Mr. President, the President of the United States deserves the support of the Congress of the United States. It is the firm opinion of this Senator that he should ask for it and in formal fashion prior to January 15.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senate is on the threshold of taking up the most important issue that any of us may ever debate or vote on—whether to go to war in the Persian Gulf. Rarely in American history has any Congress faced such a momentous decision—and rarely has our responsibility to act been so clear.

Two hundred years ago, the Founding Fathers of our Nation debated which branch of Government should have the power to take the Nation to war. What they wanted was not a monarchy with an all-powerful king, but a democracy in which the people would have a clear voice in the most important decisions of the Nation affecting their lives.

They explicitly bestowed the power to declare war on the Congress, not the President. There is no question, no doubt, no gray area on this issue. Under the Constitution, Congress declares war, not President Bush. No past abuses or usurpation of that power by previous Presidents can justify a similar abuse by President Bush.

Each of us in the Senate, as well as the President of the United States, has taken a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. To fulfill that oath of office, President Bush has a responsibility to obtain our authorization in advance, before going to war against Iraq.

So far, he refuses to do so. He claims not to need the authority of Congress to go to war. He cites examples of past Presidents who have used force without the authorization of Congress.

But President Bush has no authority to rewrite the Constitution to defend an indefensible position. Nor can he use the many incidents in which past Presidents have dispatched expeditions

to protect Americans abroad, or to root out pirates and small hostile foreign forces.

Might does not make right. What sense does it make for President Bush to oppose a ruthless dictator like Saddam Hussein by ignoring the very constitutional provisions that most differentiate our democracy from Saddam's dictatorship? By defying the Constitution, the President is forfeiting his most powerful argument against the aggression of Iraq. We have not seen such arrogance in a President since Watergate.

No President has or should ever have the unilateral right to put at risk the lives of 400,000 troops. The overwhelming majority of constitutional scholars reject his position. Is President Bush so isolated from the overwhelming opinion of the country on this point that he does not realize how little support his position has? How long can he continue to assert with any credibility that everyone is out of step except him?

Going to war in the Persian Gulf is unlike any of the 216 previous instances of use of force used to justify President Bush's position. A war in the gulf will not be over quickly and easily. It will not be Panama, Libya, or Grenada. Tens of thousands of American men and women may well die, and tens of thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians may die as well, with totally unpredictable consequences to our friends, our allies, and our vital interests in the region.

No one disputes that we have lasting and important interests in the Persian Gulf region. No one argues that we must reverse Saddam Hussein's aggression. And no one disagrees with President Bush that we cannot reward Saddam's brutality.

The American people stand united on those principles. Congress stands united on those principles. And the world community stands united on those principles.

But the American people, Congress and the world do not stand united on the need to go to war on the January 15 timetable the President has set.

For the first time in history, the world community has joined together in unified opposition to aggression. We responded quickly and effectively to deter further Iraqi advances. We imposed unprecedented, comprehensive economic sanctions to force Saddam Hussein to pay a heavy price for his invasion of Kuwait.

With time, there is a good chance that this policy will also force Saddam to withdraw from Kuwait, without further loss of life. No one can be sure that goal will be achieved. But we will never know unless we try.

Saddam Hussein is paying a heavy price for his aggression, each day the aggression lasts. Iraq's oil export earnings have dropped from \$1.5 billion a

month to zero. Saddam has occupied Kuwait's rich oilfields, but they are worthless to him now. Iraq's assets abroad have been seized. Saddam can no longer import equipment and technology for his war machine, or any other purpose. Iraq's economy is declining at an estimated rate of 5 percent a month. Sanctions are not only working, but working well, and they should be given additional time to work even more effectively.

These are goals that we have already achieved, and they are of immense value not only to the United States, but to the entire world community. They continue to be achieved with unprecedented international support, and without bloodshed.

The current strategy of sanctions is the best means, at the least cost, to persuade Saddam to withdraw from Kuwait. Sanctions are also the most realistic policy for achieving the long-run goal of dismantling Saddam's present and future arsenal of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, and ensuring that none of these weapons is ever used again.

To abandon the sanctions now, while they are achieving these tangible successes, and before they are clearly proved to have failed, is to risk tens of thousands of American lives unnecessarily.

Clearly the alternatives to war have not been exhausted, as the newest round of diplomatic activity indicates. The nations of the European Community are meeting today on the crisis. And it has just been announced that Secretary Baker will meet next week with Foreign Minister Aziz. It seems inconceivable these initiatives will have time to bear fruit by the January 15 deadline.

And yet President Bush continues headlong on his path toward an unconstitutional war. Administration spokesmen bluster about a quick and decisive victory with minimal U.S. casualties. The President has repeatedly said a war with Iraq will not be another Vietnam.

The administration obviously has estimates of casualties, but they refuse to reveal them to the American public. We do know, however, that over 45,000 body bags have been sent to the region—1 for every 10 Americans there.

No one knows exactly what type of war we will fight in the gulf. But most military experts agree that thousands of Americans may well die—perhaps tens of thousands.

A realistic estimate of the likely casualties can be made from the two recent desert wars that Israel has fought. In its 6-day victory in the 1967 war, Israel suffered over 3,000 casualties out of a force of 300,000. In the heavier fighting that lasted 20 days in the 1973 war, Israel's casualties were over 11,000—more than 3 times higher, for a force of the same size.

These figures make our casualties in Vietnam pale by comparison. We suffered roughly 200 casualties a week in Vietnam. Yet we may well be looking at 3,000 casualties a week in the gulf. President Bush may be correct that this will not be another Vietnam, but he may not realize just how different it may be.

All of us hope that the current peace initiatives will succeed. The arrangement by the majority leader to deter our debate briefly is eminently justified. We have a duty not to undercut the President. But the President also has a duty not to undercut the Constitution. And all Members of Congress have a duty to fulfill our own oaths to defend the Constitution, and I hope that we do so as soon as possible, preferably with the President's support but without it if necessary.

The American people are divided on the question of war. If we have learned anything from Vietnam, it is that we should not lead a divided nation to war. The Founding Fathers understood that principle and President Bush should also.

If we are to live in the new world order of which President Bush speaks so eloquently, we must give sanctions and diplomacy a chance. Some 400,000 American lives and the future of the Middle East hang in the balance.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LUKE APPLING

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. President, as we begin this debate on matters concerning the Persian Gulf and our Nation's decision on how to achieve our goals, the course of human events, including matters of life and death, continue.

I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of Lucius Benjamin Appling, Jr., who passed away yesterday in Cumming, GA, at the age of 83 years.

Luke Appling was one of the greatest baseball players who ever lived. His lifetime batting average was .310, with a career total of 2,749 hits. Two times he won American League batting championships, in 1936 and 1943. Twenty years of solid, all-around play deservedly led to his landslide election to the Baseball Hall of Fame by 84 percent, in 1964.

But Luke Appling was also one of the finest human beings that I have had the privilege to know. He was born in North Carolina, but he grew up and went to school in Atlanta. After his retirement as an active player in 1950,

Luke continued his association with baseball throughout the rest of his life, being a regular at oldtimers' games and at the Atlanta Braves spring training camp in West Palm Beach, where he coached new and old players in the finer techniques of batting.

A few years ago when I was visiting the Braves' spring training camp, I asked "Old Aches and Pains" if I could see for myself whether or not a curve ball really curved. As you know, we have a lot of fancy academicians around this country who have written articles over the years claiming that curve balls are only illusions.

So I asked Hall of Famer Luke Appling—19 years with the Chicago White Sox, his .388 batting average, the highest for any shortstop in baseball history—if there was such a thing as a curve. He sent Phil Niekro to the mound and told Phil Niekro he did not want him to pitch me any of those knuckle balls for which Phil Niekro was famous, but just to throw me an old country, down home, back yard, in and out of the tire hanging on the swing curve. Well, he threw it, and I do not know whether it was an illusion or not but it started out at my head and ended up on the opposite side of the plate. I, of course, dived out of the batter's box, went into the dirt, and gave my most professional dusting off when I got back up. Niekro threw another one. This one seemed to start somewhere behind my back and ended up across the plate. Finally, old Luke said, "WYCHE, let me try to show you the art of hitting the curve ball." He said, "First of all, you have to realize the thing is not an illusion; it will curve. So if it looks like it is coming at your head and is spinning in a certain direction, you stand firm and wait for the break. Second, keep your eye on the ball. Third, keep your shoulders level and swing at the stitches."

I wish this story had an ending I could brag on. It doesn't. I never hit the curve ball. I did foul a couple off. That was my crowning achievement. But listening to Luke Appling, I never was hit by the curve. I was brave enough to stand in the batter's box, and at least I got a piece of the ball.

Shirley Povich, in his column this morning in the Washington Post, said what many of us know to be true. No one who ever met Luke Appling did not like him, except, as Mr. Povich said, the American League pitchers, because "in his own way," Mr. Povich writes:

He wore them out. In addition to his career .310 batting average, Appling was the game's most famed specialist at fouling off pitches, especially when the count reached three and two. Appling said: "Put it this way. When I saw a pitch I didn't like, I just fouled it off. It was easy." Ted Lyons, the Chicago manager, vowed he once saw Appling foul off 14 straight pitches against Red Ruffing.

And he always fouled to right field. Appling explained this in his direct way. "In my first two seasons, when I didn't hit .300,

I was a straightaway hitter, so I decided to change directions."

Mr. President, I was privileged, late in his life, to know the great Luke Appling. His baseball record, and his election to the Hall of Fame speak authoritatively of his extraordinary life.

But in his death yesterday, reflecting on those lessons that he gave me on how to hit a curve, there seems to be parallels for today and for our country. Our goal in the Middle East is, yes, to assure victory, to make certain that Saddam Hussein leaves Kuwait, and the ultimate victory for our country would be to achieve that goal and bring all of our men and women home alive. To succeed in that goal, as illusory as it now seems, we may have to foul off a few pitches. We may have to foul off a few diplomatic initiatives. We may have to experiment with fouling off a few sanctions here and there until we find the ones that work and we find the pitch, not only that we can hit, but that will hit him between the eyes.

I know we have to keep our eye on the ball and not be led by impatience into risking our peoples' lives until we are sure that bad policy suggestions are fouled off; until we know that we can succeed with minimum loss of life; until all those options are considered before we swing at the best one.

If we stand firm, unafraid, and wait for the "break," then as Americans we can choose our time, if necessary, to use the force required to ensure our victory in the Persian Gulf.

We will all miss Luke Appling, but the lessons that he gave to one U.S. Senator at a spring training game, will help sustain me when the tough decisions on the best policy for our Nation must be made.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"OLD ACES AND PAINS" WOULD HAVE LOVED IT

(By Shirley Povich)

Along about noon, the news came over the radio that Luke Appling had died at 83. Then it was added that "and Luke Appling will probably be best remembered for the home run he hit off Warren Spahn in that old-timers game at RFK Stadium." The local sportscaster who delivered that belief must now himself be best remembered as a total idiot with bollixed priorities. A nin-compoop.

Anyway, let's reconstruct that RFK scene: The stadium was rigged for the old-timers' frolic, with all fields shortened so that the likes of 75-year-old Appling could hit one into the seats; especially with the fun-loving Spahn tossing up the melons he likes to throw in old-timers games. Appling laughed his way around the bases.

Appling, the near-immortal, best remembered for something like that? Luke Appling, who may have been the most famous shortstop in the 90 years of the American League—twice its batting champion, seven times a leader in assists—who was swept into Cooperstown with 84 percent of the vote; whose .388 batting average in 1936 was unmatched by any other shortstop, living or otherwise?

To honor Luke Appling most for hitting an old-timers home run is equivalent to saying six-time AL batting champion Ted Williams was distinguished mostly for his dislike of bunting, or that Joe DiMaggio was famous for failing to hit safely in that 57th game, or that the Johnstown flood could, indeed, be attributed to a leaky toilet in Altoona. What blather.

Sixty years ago when he came up to the White Sox as a kid shortstop, it wasn't immediately apparent Luke Appling belonged in the big leagues. He immediately fumbled his way into such notoriety that Chicago fans dubbed him "Kid Boots" and screamed for his removal from the lineup.

What a turnaround it became. The rookie who batted only .232 would, a couple of years later, launch a .300-plus batting career for the next 16 seasons and play in more games, 2,599, than any other shortstop in history.

For the jittery rookie shortstop with an undependable arm and fumbling habit, the renaissance occurred when the veteran Jimmy Dykes joined the Sox as their third baseman. Appling said Dykes steadied him. He remembered a day in St. Louis when, with the bases full in the ninth, he booted a groundball that lost the game, and then later moaned to Dykes: "Why did they have to hit one to me in that spot?" Appling said that's when Dykes told him: "You gotta change your attitude. In a spot like that, get yourself to wanting them to hit it to you."

When Appling retired in 1950, his baseball age was a number at which Luke and his friends had been winking for years. Luke said his draft card exposed him as two years older. "Couldn't lie to the government," he said. "Maybe they wouldn't like it." (The Baseball Encyclopedia says he was 81, so we'll never be sure exactly how old he was.)

Among Appling's nonadmirers were the AL pitchers. In his own way, he wore them out. In addition to his career .310 batting average, Appling was the game's most famed specialist at fouling off pitches, especially when the count reached three and two. Appling said: "Put it this way. When I saw a pitch I didn't like, I just fouled it off. It was easy." Ted Lyons, the Chicago manager, vowed he once saw Appling foul off 14 straight pitches against Red Ruffing.

And he always fouled to right field. Appling explained this in his direct way. "In my first two seasons, when I didn't hit .300, I was a straightaway hitter, so I decided to change directions."

Around the league, they also knew him as the AL's greatest moaner, constantly complaining of some illness or injury. "Old Aches and Pains" they called him when Appling spoke of his lameness or fractures or conjunctivitis, or other ills. A Chicago writer once wrote: "An unhealthy Appling is the best thing the Sox have going for them."

How did Appling get to the big leagues? Well, it might be said he was a timely hitter. His Oglethorpe College team was playing Mercer on a day when an Atlanta scout was in the stands, and Luke simply picked that day to hit four home runs. Atlanta signed him and sold him to the White Sox for \$25,000.

In later years, it was during a debate about the comparative speeds of newcomer Bob Feller and Lefty Grove that Appling delivered an opinion agreeing with that of Walter Johnson. "I think Grove was a mite faster," he said. Having faced both of them numerous times, he could be considered an informed source.

After two years at Oglethorpe, Appling took early retirement to try his luck at

baseball. At a class reunion many years later they presented him with a plaque that may not have been overstated when it pronounced him "the South's greatest ballplayer since Ty Cobb." Seems he was famous for something else besides hitting an old-timers game home run.

SALUTE TO GEORGIA TECH— NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. President, I rise with considerable pride and pleasure to offer my congratulations to the Georgia Institute of Technology on its well-earned national co-championship in NCAA Division I football.

The Yellow Jackets came from nowhere, being unranked in the polls until after their third game of the season, to finish as the only undefeated team in Division I. Along the way came the fantastic victory at Virginia at a time when that school was undefeated and ranked No. 1, and, of course, the impressive Citrus Bowl win on New Year's Day over perennial power Nebraska.

Georgia Tech President Pat Crecine, Athletic Director Homer Rice, Coach Bobby Ross, and, of course, the players, lead by All-American Ken Swilling and Citrus Bowl MVP Shawn Jones, richly deserve the honor which the football coaches of America, in the UPI pool, have bestowed upon them.

This capped a tremendous year for Georgia Tech athletics which saw their basketball team advance to the final four, and their baseball and golf squads post impressive seasons as well.

I would be remiss if I did not conclude by observing that in spite of all this athletic success, what I am proudest of at Georgia Tech is the school's continuing commitment to athletic excellence and academic excellence. Athletic success is wonderful; it makes all of us sports fans feel real good. But the true measure of a college, in my estimation, is its academic success.

Georgia Tech's victories in teaching, math, science, engineering, and other critical subjects serve all Americans well in making our country competitive on the international playing field.

We all are thankful for Tech's great success and know that that continuing record of excellence on and off the field will continue.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WIRTH. I thank the Chair.

WAR POWERS

Mr. WIRTH. I, too, commend my colleagues from Iowa and Washington for getting us to the point where we have a chance to at least open the debate about our policy in the Persian Gulf and about the responsibilities of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. President, the position in which the Congress finds itself is one of very difficult timing. Clearly, in starting this debate and beginning to share views and to come to understand where our colleagues are, where they believe their constituents are, where we believe the people of the country are, it is absolutely imperative as we do so we not in any way undercut the initiatives of the administration and particularly the new approaches of Secretary Baker in discussions in Geneva with the Iraqi Foreign Minister, which we hope will occur shortly.

I think the Congress, and the majority leader in particular, has done a very careful and good job of bending over backward to allow the President to conduct this foreign policy and military policy in the most flexible way possible. That is our responsibility, but at the same time, while we are assuring that the Secretary of State is not in any way compromised or undercut, we have a responsibility to our constituents, a responsibility to what I believe is a very significant majority of Americans who are deeply troubled by this policy, who are legitimately asking where is the Congress. We have a responsibility, one, to debate this issue. Second, to air it in a public education fashion as thoroughly as we possibly can; and third, ultimately to come up with a resolution that we believe is appropriate for the country.

So in a way we are on the horns of a dilemma, on the one hand to be allowing the administration the flexibility which they must have to conduct our policy; on the other hand, to exercise our constitutional and constituent responsibilities to stand up ourselves as to where we believe we ought to be. That provides us with a very narrow window of time between the very famous date of January 15—I think we have to come to a resolution before the 15th—and, on the other hand, the date of Secretary Baker's discussion which will occur presumably within the next few days.

That provides a very narrow window of time, and within that window of time I think we are faced with some very significant debate, a very important debate and one that I think our constituents expect us to carry out thoroughly, carefully, and with all the divergence of views that make up this country.

In voicing my own views, I believe President Bush in August 1990 did the right thing. He embarked upon a three-part policy, a policy to say to Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi Government, go

no further, a policy of containment, and for that we moved American troops very rapidly into Saudi Arabia.

The second part of the policy was to say we are going to do this as much as possible within an international coalition, with the U.N. flag wherever possible. The administration did a very good job of building broad international support for the program.

The third part of the policy was to use as our primary weapon economic sanctions. We set in motion a program of establishing land, air, and sea sanctions against the country of Iraq, sanctions which probably in this situation have the best potential of any economic boycott program of working with a country like Iraq, given the geography and the relationship of Iraq to the rest of the world, outlets to the sea, outlets to the outside world. It is almost a case study area for getting an economic boycott to work.

So it was a three-pronged policy, Mr. President: First containment; second, international coalition; third, sanctions, a three-pronged program that I believe, Mr. President, had very, very broad public support in the country and certainly very broad support in the Congress. We had a debate and a vote on support for that program in September, and we overwhelmingly in this body voted in support of the President's program. I think that was the right thing to do.

So through September and October, I think people felt as if the program being pursued by the United States was the right program. It has very broad support within the Congress and I think we were reflecting our constituents. The support for the program was very broad nationally as well.

Something changed, however, Mr. President, soon after the election. Soon after the election, the President did two things which really changed the original successful three-part program. The rhetoric moved right after the election from rhetoric that had been a discussion of a defensive measure into discussion for the first time of offensive activity, a very significant shift—and those words are very carefully chosen and have a great deal of meaning. They had a defensive posture versus an offensive posture. They move from defense to offense.

So that changed the nature of the way in which the Persian Gulf situation was apparently being viewed by the administration. At the same time the administration decided to use troops from Europe to augment the troops in the gulf instead of using the troops from Europe to rotate with the troops in the gulf.

We were going to move from a little over 200,000 troops in the gulf to more than 400,000 American military personnel in the gulf area, a very significant increase in our capability.

So having initially followed a policy—that three-part policy that made sense, of containment, international coalition, and United Nations sanctions—having followed that successful policy for 2 months, we suddenly made a significant shift and moved from a defensive posture to an offensive posture; and, moved from an accepted military strategy which was to use troops from Europe as rotation with troops that were in the Persian Gulf rather than using those as an augmentation strategy.

Since that shift very soon after the election there has now emerged a very significant debate, and the right debate in this country, about why we are in the Persian Gulf; what our goals are: why did we shift from the original strategy to this new strategy; how does this new strategy relate to our national goal; at what cost? There was a lot of discussion that heard—how many troops; how many casualties will we be willing to tolerate; a brand new part of the discussion; for what duration; how long would we expect the warfare to occur? Is it going to be a 2-day war, a 4-day war? Will we have the patience to sit out a boycott? There are questions of duration, and absolutely important ones. These are all the more narrow questions about our role there.

And then the broader question: What is our role in the Arab world? What would be the implications if we won in Iraq? What would we be left with? What would be the expectation of the United States? What kind of reaction might there be across the Arab world? What are the implications of this particular set of circumstances in the Persian Gulf for the so-called new world order? What is the U.S. role in a new world order? How much should we be expecting of our allies? How much are we our brother's keeper?

We are the remaining superpower in the world. Does that mean we have superpower responsibilities to become even more our brother's keeper than we were in the past or are we going to weave a broader fabric including more of our allies and other countries in this whole definition or redefinition of "the new world order?"

Finally, that long-term policy that comes so much to home. What is the U.S. role related to energy? And will we have the wisdom to use the crisis in the Persian Gulf to once again reestablish every national policy?

This debate began in earnest again very soon after President Bush changed our strategy moving from a defensive to an offensive posture and after we changed the troop rotation strategy to an augmentation strategy approach in the Persian Gulf area.

At that time there was some rhetoric—in November or December—that Congress ought to come in, stop ducking the issue, fulfill its responsibility, and vote. We heard some of that discus-

sion here on the Senate floor—the kind of suggestions that sound good if you say them fast enough.

But the real question is what would we be coming in and voting on? There was no resolution before the U.S. Congress. There was no resolution sent up to the U.S. Congress from the White House. We had a policy that appeared to be changing day to day. We had a rationale for being there which was constantly shifting.

The President clearly did not want us to be coming in; did not want us to be voting. And I think very quickly in November, we set aside that kind of loose rhetoric about coming back, stop ducking our responsibilities, and, rather instead of coming into what would have been a ruckus, not having consensus, having unguided discussion on the floor of the U.S. Senate, we came instead and did what we could do best trying to diagnose issues, hone down those issues through a series of hearings and through a major public education effort.

I was privileged, Mr. President, to be a part of those hearings as a member of the Armed Services Committee, quite remarkable hearings chaired by Senator NUNN, which Senator NUNN and Senator WARNER jointly cochaired, and which I believe had an enormous impact on the discussions of our policy.

We had experts of all kinds, and a clear record of that set of hearings has been established. It was broadly televised as well. I think the American people were fascinated to see this very divergent set of views, and particularly to see Americans with such distinguished records, such as the former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, former Secretaries of Defense, experts of all kinds, come in and clearly question the policy which was then the new policy being pursued by the administration.

Most remarkable to me in those hearings were the statements of maybe the two most distinguished men, military people of the last 25 years, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under President Carter, Air Force Gen. David Jones, and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under Ronald Reagan, Adm. William Crowe.

These two gentlemen have very, very broad support, great friendships here on the Hill, great respect around the country, distinguished military résumés—again probably as distinguished military records as any Americans of the last quarter century. I was most struck by the commentary of two of them.

On that Wednesday morning in the Dirksen Building, the two of them came forward and in summary said to the Armed Services Committee and said to the country, "What is the rush?"

In summary, that was the statement made by these two former chairmen of

the Joint Chiefs of Staff. What is the rush? they asked. Sanctions are working. Clearly, those sanctions are going to over a long-term period of time hurt the Iraqi military. They are going to dramatically limit their ability to do a lot of training missions as they do not have the spare parts necessary to do the replacements. They will have to do a lot of cannibalization of their equipment. They are missing and are incapable of producing a lot of tires and lubrications and so on necessary for a modern military machine.

The capacity to produce spare parts is dramatically limited, and clearly the sanctions, said these two distinguished American military thinkers, said the Iraqi military capability is going to be significantly limited.

Second, we were advised that we ought to reflect patience, that the American soldier—the best trained soldiers we have had, the most capable military, in terms of personnel since the end of the Second War by all accounts—this remarkable group of young Americans in our military are trained as American military has never been trained certainly in the last 45 years, trained to fight, but at the same time trained to wait.

These are men who are trained to be patient just as they are trained to fight, putting I think a bit of a shadow over the issue. Well, we do not have the patience to wait it out.

While certainly our military is trained to have the patience to wait it out, we are also reminded the United States has demonstrated enormous patience as well. There are those who say that we would not have the patience to wait out an embargo, we would not have the patience to sit and wait, keep the pressure on Saddam Hussein. That particular statement, that hypothesis, is denied by our own recent history.

For the last 40 years, right up to the end of the cold war, the United States waited and waited with great care. We waited out the Soviet Union and the cold war was won at relatively little expense in terms of human lives—great military expense, great commitment of scarce national treasure, but we waited, Mr. President, and we waited with a very, very successful outcome.

As one of our witnesses said, during that period of time there were some who were suggesting that we should have bombed Moscow: Would that not have been a great idea? That is the question that came from the witness. Would not that have been a great idea?

Finally, our witnesses told us that while we should praise the effort of broadening the coalition of our allies which we should be doing and which we have done very well, the effort to bring in dozens of countries from around the world in this effort, certainly we ought to broaden both the numbers of countries supporting this, and the military

and financial commitment coming from those other countries.

Admiral Crowe and General Jones had some very tough language for some of those countries and the fact that they had not contributed very much. I will come back to that later.

We really got a very different and very rational picture in those hearings that Senator NUNN chaired. As the country saw that set of hearings and as the country sat back and reflected in early December on our purposes and our goals, I think that the momentum toward war began to significantly slow down. The Congress did its job and did it very well through that set of Armed Services Committee hearings, followed by hearings chaired by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, and that was followed by hearings of the House Armed Services Committee. The country began to see that there were significantly different alternatives.

Following those sets of hearings, we saw two significant changes. One, the President offered to send Secretary Baker to Baghdad, and he invited the Iraqi Foreign Minister to come to the White House, which was a dramatic change of policy from an administration that said we would not talk to the Iraqis at all until they were completely out of Kuwait.

In December the President changed that policy, to everybody's great surprise, and I think many people were very pleased by that nod by the President, that concession, to have these discussions, and soon after that there appeared to be a response from the Iraqis as well, and the hostages came home.

It appeared that there was some diplomatic momentum, and that, I think, was very welcome to many of us who believed that we ought to exhaust every other possibility before we moved into any kind of military action.

Unfortunately, that momentum has apparently stopped. And while the Members of Congress have been away over the last couple of weeks, back in our districts and States, the field has essentially reverted back to one where only one voice on this issue has been heard, and that is the voice of the administration.

It is now time again for another set of voices to be reentering the dialog, which is why the opportunities that we have today and the opportunities we will have next week are so terribly important. The American public should have the opportunity to focus on other options, to focus on a different set of thinking on what we are doing in the Persian Gulf and why.

Mr. President, I want to raise a number of questions that I think are very important, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the opening statement that I

prepared for the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings on November 27, which includes a series of questions which we worked out, identifying a number of the long-term options and long-term possibilities and long-term liabilities that exist or emerge from various actions in the Persian Gulf.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT, SENATOR TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend you and the Ranking Minority Member, Mr. Warner, for calling the Committee back to Washington to discuss and debate U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf. This is an extraordinarily important set of hearings, especially in light of the Bush Administration's recent decision to nearly double U.S. deployments of Saudi Arabia.

In my view, the United States last August embarked upon a proper course of action in the Gulf: to stop Iraqi aggression and defend Saudi Arabia; to impose economic sanctions against Iraq; and to weave together a broad international coalition to isolate Iraq. In support of this policy, between August and October we deployed over 200,000 troops to Saudi Arabia and the Gulf region. This policy and deployment were broadly supported by the American people.

However, the President has now decided to add an additional 230,000 troops to Operation Desert Shield. That decision will inevitably lead to a sharp rise in logistics, support, morale, training, and cultural problems that are already causing difficulties. I would point that these problems are inherent in the deployment of such a tremendous number of troops in a faraway land and not a reflection on our fighting men and women in the Gulf. Our troops are professionals. They are well trained, well motivated, and well equipped and our nation should be proud of the sacrifices they are making for their country.

But I fear that with this decision the President has veered away from his successful August policy and toward one fraught with significant danger. It is not clear to me why the Administration has seemingly chosen to cast aside the course it originally set, especially when the best evidence we have indicates that it has been working. Yet, in October the Administration began drawing attention to the plight of the hostages, suggesting that their maltreatment might constitute a sufficient provocation for military action. In November, the Administration decided to double our forces to ready for the "offensive option," which in turn changed the public perception of and support for our policy in the Gulf. And last week, the Administration focussed on the Iraqi nuclear threat, a concern not coincidentally borne out in recent opinion polls.

Today as this Committee meets, the Administration is working to achieve United Nations support for offensive action against Saddam. This has been called—properly, I think—a "hold our coat" resolution: we ask others for permission to hold our coats while we send young Americans to fight and die in the Arabian desert. The President and others have spent countless hours describing our goals to other countries, and persuading various allies of the virtue of the Administration's purpose. We have not had the benefit of this effort, despite the fact that the Administration's authority derives from the

people of the United States and from, the people's Constitution.

We must know, for example, why the United States has apparently changed from a defensive strategy to an offensive strategy. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Powell, in testimony to this Committee on September 11, focussed exclusively on defending Saudi Arabia and enforcing UN sanctions as the reasons for sending U.S. troops to the Persian Gulf. This was the military mission of Phase One; it was defensive in nature and the Senate overwhelmingly voted to support that defensive mission.

President Bush's decision on November 8 to augment our forces in the Gulf with another 230,000 troops represents a departure from that defensive policy. The forces now being deployed in Saudi Arabia are the very forces we were going to use to replace currently stationed forces as part of a troop rotation policy. Rather than sending a message about our enduring commitment to turn back Iraqi aggression, the President chose to set in motion momentum toward war in early 1991. We are further "Americanizing" the equation in the Gulf.

Why the apparent change of strategy? Iraq is now the object of the most comprehensive set of sanctions in history. The impact of these sanctions on the Iraqi military is already palpable, and continues daily to erode their military preparedness. Iraq is the object of unprecedented international opprobrium. Post Cold War diplomacy is at work, and it is focussed on Saddam. Where is the evidence that our collective will to enforce sanctions is weakening?

Alternatively, the costs of offensive action are incalculable: How many lives will be lost? What will be the impact on oil prices? On the U.S. and world economy? Will Israel get drawn into a widening Gulf war? What happens to the forces of Arab nationalism when Americans begin killing Arabs? By initiating a conflict in the Gulf, we will set in motion unforeseeable—and potentially disastrous—consequences. Can the Administration confidently say that a military solution will end this crisis in a predictable way and at a reasonable cost? The unknowns and the liabilities of the war option are far more troublesome to me than the problems of maintaining the international sanctions.

The most effective means of dealing with Saddam, the most effective long-range strategy for containing Iraqi aggressive potential, is through sustained international isolation of Iraq. Any other steps must certainly include close cooperation and involvement by United Nations forces; we cannot and should not be policeman to the world.

The UN Security Council may pass a resolution this week which will authorize the use of force against Iraq. That does not mean that the use of force early in the new year is wise, in our national interest or even useful in building the much-touted "new world order." A UN resolution is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the U.S. to go to war. In order to go to war we must have the support of the American people and a decision by the Congress. A UN resolution on the use of force is good politics, Congressional approval is a Constitutional requirement.

I do not believe that support exists today for offensive activity. The American people have yet to be convinced that our vital national interests are sufficiently at risk in the Persian Gulf to engage American troops in combat. We have had a wide range of explanation from the Administration about why we are in the Persian Gulf. According to the

Administration we may go to war: to restore the legitimate government of Kuwait, to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait, to protect Americans abroad, to provide regional stability, to enforce the sanctions, to assure a reliable supply of oil, to protect American jobs, to build a new world order, to destroy Saddam's weapons of mass destruction, and all of the above.

I do not doubt for a moment the seriousness of the Gulf crisis, nor the imperative of a vigorous American response. I believe we have mounted such a response, and remain capable of taking military action if and when necessary, especially with devastating air and naval power. Rather than suggesting that time is on Saddam's side, we should make clear our intention to stay in for as long as necessary. At our presently planned troop levels—without a rotation policy—we cannot do that.

Finally, it is imperative that the Administration formulate a clear set of goals in the Persian Gulf and that the President articulates those goals clearly and unambiguously to the American people. To date, the President and Secretary Baker have done an admirable job of fashioning a broad international alliance in the Persian Gulf. But they have spent much less time and far fewer resources explaining their position to the American people and to their representatives in the Congress.

We, of course, should not give the Administration a blank check. Nor should we rush to give them authority they have not even requested. Rather, our responsibilities include raising questions, reflecting skepticism, and digging beneath the immediate gloss of patriotic action to force answers to difficult questions.

These hearings are important, Mr. Chairman, in giving us the opportunity to go back to basics: Why are we in the Persian Gulf? What are our national interests in that important region? What are the long-term implications of alternative courses of action for the U.S. and the region?

While suggestions have been made that questions by Senators may only encourage Iraq, it is, in fact, the lack of consistent purposes that seems most puzzling to the American public. Ironically, support may "unravel" not because of public debate, but from the lack of a clear and consistent message from the Administration.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would just note that, in my view, our genuine national concerns are threefold—secure energy supplies; Iraq's weapons; and Israel—and I am unconvinced that initiating military action would resolve those concerns predictably and satisfactorily. We have already protected the oil fields. World supply has steadied, and in this sense our goal has been achieved. The continuing security of energy supplies may require an ongoing international presence and commitment, but war poses great uncertainty.

Concerning Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, this problem existed before August 2, and cannot be dealt with by military operations alone. The Osirak reactor was destroyed in 1981, but here we are once again debating how to deal with Iraq's nuclear weapons program. Finally, the Gulf crisis poses real risks to the state of Israel. War in the region holds untold dangers for Israel, militarily and politically, as does our unnecessary and unwise policy of support for President Assad of Syria.

It seems to me that the fundamental question in the Gulf is not whether or not Saddam Hussein is a brutal dictator that de-

erves to be overthrown—clearly he is—but instead whether going to war with Iraq will put the United States in a better position to work in the Middle East over the long run. I believe that our primary national goal should be to promote long term stability in the Middle East and Gulf region. Given the Administration's recent actions, I do not believe that we are currently approaching the Gulf crisis in this manner. In my view, an American initiation of war with Iraq is not only fraught with dangers in the short run, but would also lead to a destructive polarization in the Arab world that will make long term U.S. goals in the region more difficult to achieve.

Lastly, I would point out that war in the Persian Gulf will put all the Western hostages in a very precarious position to say the least. Not only are many hostages located at strategic sites that will be likely targets of Air Force bombs, but it is difficult to imagine a man like Saddam Hussein sparing the lives of American and Western hostages while his own troops are fighting and dying. Patience is a virtue, it is not a vice. The wait may be difficult for the families of the hostages and it is certainly difficult for the hostages themselves to point out that it was a policy of patience, consistently applied over a long period of time, that brought every one of our hostages out of Tehran—alive.

I would like to commend you, Mr. Chairman, and the Ranking Republican, Mr. Warner, for holding these important hearings at a very critical juncture. As we enter these hearings, I have prepared an illustrative set of broad policy issues which I believe we must address, and I ask unanimous consent that these questions concerning U.S. policy in the Gulf appear following my remarks. Thank you.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING U.S. POLICY IN THE PERSIAN GULF

1. What are our policy objectives for the Persian Gulf region following possible international military action?

There has been much speculation about the kinds of military action which might be taken, but not a lot of thought about their outcomes. What kinds of military victory might there be? What would the U.S. do with a military victory? Would we seek to create a new regime for Baghdad? How would we do that? Would the U.S. become an army of occupation in Iraq?

2. What would be the nature of a long term U.S. military presence in the Gulf, if the Iraqis were to withdraw from Kuwait?

It would appear that a long term military presence will be necessary in the Gulf in order to continue to offer protection to both Kuwait and to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. What will be the nature of that force and what will the U.S. role be in it? Secretary Baker has proposed a "NATO-like" organization, implying a long-term U.S. presence. Is that what he meant? Would that be desirable?

3. What would be the nature of a long term U.S. military presence in the Gulf, if the Iraqis were to suffer a military defeat?

Would the regional military requirements be altered by a Iraqi military defeat?

4. What dangers would follow from a shift in the regional military balance from Iraq to Iran?

If there were military action between the international coalition and the Iraqis, the result would likely be an overwhelming military victory for the coalition and the decimation of the Iraqi armed forces. One con-

sequence would likely be a dramatic shifting of the regional military balance of power toward Iran. What would be the implications of that for U.S. interests?

5. What is the sense of selling advanced weapons to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia?

Kuwait was unable to defend itself and U.S. military force was needed in order to defend Saudi Arabia, despite the fact that the Saudis, for the last decade, have been engaged in the most massive military build-up in the world with the exception of the Japanese. The advanced weapons owned by the Kuwaitis were captured by the Iraqis and then, apparently, integrated into their armed forces. The same thing could happen to Saudi Arabia and their weapons would then become available to an anti-Israeli coalition. What then is the purpose of selling technologically advanced weapons to countries which cannot defend themselves?

6. How can the U.S. conduct military action to minimize Iraqi (and not merely American) casualties?

Saddam's regime is related to the Iraqi people in a different fashion than Khomeini's regime was related to the Iranian people when the latter seized U.S. diplomats. Given that, it is clear that the Iraqi people are not the enemies of the United States, but only their regime. What kinds of military policies can be pursued to recognize that?

7. What is the U.S. doing to prevent the dismemberment of Iraq?

In the event of military action against Iraq, what would be the likelihood of members of the international coalition—Turkey and Syria, in particular—attempting to exercise irredentist claims against Iraq. Those two states might seek to enter Iraq to seize portions of its territory. The implications of unstable borders in the Middle East would be disastrous.

8. What would be the American response to an act of international terrorism?

The Abu Nidal organization, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command under Ahmad Jibril (the same group many believe was behind the bombing of Pan Am 103 over Lockerbie), as well as the Palestine Liberation Front under Abul Abbas all appear now to be beholden to Saddam Hussein. The U.S. has already warned Saddam of the consequences of his sponsorship of international terrorism, but how would we be able to ascertain who was responsible for a terrorist action and then be able to punish Saddam when we have yet to conclusively establish responsibility for the bombing of Pan Am 103? (Of course, Jibril appears to have executed his terrorism at the request of the Iranians when he was based in Syria.)

9. What are we doing to encourage an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait aside from threatening them?

Talking about the Cuban Missile Crisis, Secretary of State Dean Rusk recalled the words of the Chinese strategist Sun Tzu in his *The Art of War* to the effect that you should always "build golden bridges behind the enemy" to facilitate his withdrawal. If the enemy believed there was no good out, he would fight. Are we doing anything to convince Saddam that withdrawal is preferable to staying in Kuwait and facing a sure military defeat imposed by the international coalition?

10. Do you think there should be direct communications between the Iraqis and the U.S. while the Iraqis are in Kuwait?

During the Cuban Missile Crisis, there were a number of direct communications between the U.S. and USSR, including a visit

by Robert Kennedy to the Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin in Washington. Are we meeting with the Iraqis now? Should we?

11. Do you favor offering concessions to Saddam to facilitate his withdrawal from Kuwait?

The President has articulated the idea that there should be no rewards for aggression. Yet the U.S. negotiated the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba, offering them a written pledge that the U.S. would not invade Cuba and that the U.S. would withdraw missiles from Turkey. That appears to be offering them concessions. Yet the Cuban Missile Crisis is generally considered to be a great victory for the U.S. Isn't it possible that we could make the Iraqis some similar offers? General Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said there were three ways to get the Soviet missiles out of Cuba—"we could talk them out, we could squeeze them out, or we could shoot them out." Why not do the same thing to the Iraqis?

12. If Saddam were to withdraw, can his weapons of mass destruction be made ineffective?

Will it be possible to maintain an embargo on the supply of "dual use" technology and military equipment to prevent Iraq from continuing its chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons programs?

13. What is the danger that military conflict will disrupt oil exports from the Persian Gulf?

Does Iraq have the capacity to reduce Saudi Arabia's ability to export petroleum? What are the conditions under which they would be successful in using that capacity?

14. What policies should the U.S. pursue in order to contribute to the long term stability of the Middle East?

The sources of the instability in the Middle East are far more pervasive than the problem of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. How can we pursue policies in regards to this crisis which will simultaneously contribute to longer term stability in the region?

15. Will killing Arabs in a military confrontation with Iraq so offend Arab sensibilities that the long term position of the United States and the West in the Middle East will be irreparably damaged?

Islamic fundamentalism is everywhere on the rise in the Middle East. There are, of course, varieties of fundamentalism so that all fundamentalism need not have the consequences for the people of the region or for the West that were produced by the Khomeini regime in Iran. Nonetheless, the basic fundamentalist position is hostility to the West which they perceive as seeking to destroy Islam. Any Western military action is likely to strengthen the claim of fundamentalists and thus enhance their political positions. Only days ago, the Jordanian Parliament elected an Islamic fundamentalist as Speaker. Now that Yassir Arafat has lost credibility, an alternative to his leadership of the Palestinian cause may come from the fundamentalist wing of the Palestinian movement. Surely military action will speed this trend.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, we are back in the debate over this set of issues which begins as it should. We have an obligation, as I pointed out, to make sure that Secretary Baker has the timing and the support for his initiative, and we all hope that those initiatives are successful.

We also have an obligation to our constituents for us to act in the Sen-

ate, and we are going to have a relatively narrow period of time. That debate includes, again, an examination of our initial strategy. Was that containment strategy satisfactory? Did that containment strategy suggest that we are going to have a long-term involvement in the Persian Gulf? Assume that that strategy works and Saddam Hussein leaves Kuwait and returns to Baghdad; does that mean the United States is going to have a force in the Persian Gulf, Saudi Arabia, over a long period of time? What is the Arab reaction to that going to be? How do we internationalize that force as much as possible? There are a whole series of questions.

Should we be returning to the original rotation strategy at this time to have the troops coming in from Europe, to act that way, so after the 6-month stage they can move back to the United States, as our doctrine suggested they should do?

We have a series of questions on that containment issue and also on sanctions. What do we know about the sanctions and how well they have worked?

I was struck by two major national newspapers discussing sanctions last week. One of the stories was that the sanctions were working very well, and the front page story from the other was that sanctions were not working very well. One of the items that we have to get much more information from this administration is those sanctions and how well they have worked. I believe this is the perfect place for sanctions to be allowed to work and that we should be patient and certainly let them work over a much, much, longer period of time; that it makes no sense for us to be moving toward imminent military action, particularly on the ground in Kuwait, while we have remaining to us this great opportunity to make sanctions work.

Third, Mr. President, we should be debating on the floor the role of the United Nations and the role of the other countries around the world and their responsibilities to this effort.

I have been disappointed that the President of the United States has, as I see it, paid greater attention and spent a lot more time providing a photo opportunity to President Assad of Syria in that discussion he had in Geneva some weeks ago—the head of a country that is at the top of our list of terrorist countries, ones that we have not embraced and approved, as the President did in Geneva. There was this major legitimization of the Government of Syria. We spent a great deal of time doing that and also in bringing the Chinese Government in out of the cold. The President received the Chinese Foreign Minister at a much publicized meeting at the White House, essentially saying what you did at Tiananmen Square does not matter

anymore; we would like to have your help here. The Chinese abstained on the Security Council action, and we are embracing the Syrians and the Chinese. We have a lot more work to do to make sure that others of our allies are committing themselves more significantly.

I will close with some comments about that. We have to go back, I think, to our initial strategy and discuss that containment strategy and the implications, both short and long term, and discuss sanctions, how well they are working and how long we are prepared—which I hope is a long period of time—to let the sanctions work out before we resort to force; third, how do we broaden and strengthen that international coalition where the United States is paying all too great a part of the price?

Mr. President, I sent to Senator NUNN a letter outlining a series of questions on the costs and commitments of our allies. That was dated November 30. I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD at this point, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, November 30, 1990.

Hon. SAM NUNN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the course of this week's hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, Committee members rightly expressed broad support for the President's efforts in bringing together an international consensus and coalition opposed to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. At the same time, members also registered deep concern over the price the United States may have paid in securing continuing support of U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf.

Secretary Webb addressed this issue directly in his testimony of November 29:

"The President has assembled a broadly-based coalition of nations who agree on the narrow issue of Iraq's occupation of Kuwait, and who diverge on just about everything else. While these efforts are commendable, many Americans have become rather amazed at the lengths the Administration has gone over the past few months to keep the coalition together. . . . The political and economic promises our Administration appears to have made in exchange for much of this support have yet to be revealed. And the price we may be asked to pay in terms of unspoken commitments could come back to haunt us."

We already know some of the costs of keeping this coalition together. We have, at the President's request, forgiven \$7.1 billion in military loans to the government of Egypt. President Bush reversed long-standing U.S. policy to meet publicly with President Assad of Syria, a nation still considered a terrorist state by the U.S. Government. The Bush Administration has reversed political sanctions imposed on the People's Republic of China following the Tiananmen Square massacre by inviting the Chinese Foreign Minister to Washington.

What other promises have been made? I believe the American people and the Congress

deserve a full accounting of the costs—direct and indirect, financial and political—incurred by the Administration on behalf of the American people in pursuit of policy objectives in the Persian Gulf.

I hope that the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations will explore these issues with Secretary Cheney and Secretary Baker at next week's hearings. Further oversight may be necessary to arrive at a thorough understanding of the costs incurred on behalf of Operation Desert Shield, and I look forward to cooperating with you in this endeavor.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

TIMOTHY E. WIRTH.

Mr. WIRTH. Part of this debate also, it seems to me, clearly should reaffirm our national goal, and I think it is agreed upon that Saddam Hussein get out of Kuwait. I think that should be part of this debate and part of any resolution that we in the United States Senate would agree upon, that the Iraqis certainly should get out of Kuwait, and that we in no way, shape, or form will condone that kind of activity.

At the same time, I think we should point out, Mr. President, that should force be used at some point, it should be used as a last resort. We should not shrink from the willingness to use force if our national interests are clearly at stake. We believe that our national interests are at stake, and it is agreed upon that that is something we should not have to do, and we should not shrink from that.

(Mr. SIMON assumed that chair.)

Mr. WIRTH. Let us be very careful about defining what our national interests are and understanding what the implications of that use of force in our national interest may be. And certainly at this point I think it is difficult to say that we are in fact seeing our national interests so threatened that we want to move in with massive force in the Persian Gulf area.

For example, is energy so threatened that it is absolutely imperative that the United States commit this enormous military machine because of energy? I do not believe so. We have seen now almost a glut once again of oil on the world market. The Iraqi production is off the world market; Kuwaiti production is off the world market. We have seen the Saudis increase production. We have seen production increase elsewhere as well. The price of oil is once again going down, and I think we are not seeing us endangered in energy.

So are we there for the purposes of endangerment of energy? I think not, but clearly this overall energy policy must be looked at, not only in this debate, but for long-term purposes as well.

As I said in my opening comment, I would hope that if there is a silver lining in this whole situation in the Persian Gulf, it is that we commit ourselves to energy policy and have a real energy policy in the United States.

And that is not rocket science, Mr. President; it is not a great mystery what we have to do in the United States.

It is not great mystery that we have to move toward efforts of fuel efficiency, economic efficiency, and energy efficiency much greater than what we have now. Automobile efficiency alone, in increasing the miles per gallon, as Senator BRYAN's legislation suggested, will save us more than 2 million barrels a day. We are importing about 8 million barrels a day. About 25 percent of our imported oil can be saved by fuel efficiency with automobiles alone.

Another 25 percent could be saved, Mr. President, if we moved to alternative fuels, moved away from dependence on gasoline alone for fueling our transportation sector; 66 percent of the oil that we consume in the United States goes for transportation.

Are we stuck entirely doing that with oil? Not at all. We ought to have the opportunity to move that as well, and make the opportunity to move away from our dependence on oil as the almost exclusive fuel driving our transportation sector, and move from there, for example, to natural gas. We have vast reserves of natural gas in the United States, and even greater reserves in North America, Canada, Mexico; very secure reserves.

And what we ought to be doing is everything we can to move from an economy so dependent upon oil for transportation to begin to use some of the other fuels we have. We know from the debate on the Clean Air Act and analyses of the Clean Air Act that if we were to make that move and do just a relatively aggressive job in moving to alternative fuels, particularly in natural gas, we could save another 2 million barrels of oil a day. Just in the transportation sector alone, Mr. President, we can save about 25 percent of the oil that we use in the United States—just in the transportation sector alone.

And these are not items that have been suggested by the Chief of Staff from the White House that are going to force dramatic changes, such as people will not be able to drive any more, that your lifestyles are going to be threatened, and so on. Not at all.

Fuel efficiency in automobiles, alternative fuels, is just a first step. There is a whole variety of other things that we can do in terms of building and development, making sure that our stock of housing is much more fuel efficient, looking at various sectors of heavy industry where there is still room for significant efficiencies, across the board; an efficient national energy policy can be established again. It is not rocket science; we know what has to be done. It is a matter of simple political will and agreement to arrive at that.

Then, Mr. President, to look at alternative fuels strategies beyond the cur-

rently available fuels, to be encouraging solar energy, to be moving, as some have suggested, toward the policies of solar-hydrogen economy, to begin examining the nuclear possibility, start all over on nuclear to see if we can develop a safer and cost effective nuclear program that will be able to solve the proliferation problems, the waste disposal problems. Lots of problems come along with nuclear. We must have responsibility to the future, to see if we can develop a nuclear program that works. If we can, we will not have our grandchildren asking us: Why did you not try that option when you had that possibility? I think as reasonable individuals we should embark upon such a research program.

There is a variety of other things that have to be done as part of the energy strategy, and I hope the debate we have here over the coming weeks will encourage and solidify in this body and the people at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue in the White House to undertake a national energy program. Secretary Watkins has been very forthcoming about this, the need to do it. From all press reports, he has been significantly stymied by Mr. Sununu and Mr. Darman.

I would hope that the President, who has committed us to a very, very potentially dangerous strategy in the Middle East, will find that we ought to intervene at least through a national energy program, and have that as one of the results of the next 6 to 9 months.

Finally, Mr. President, we have to be sure that the economic burdensharing in the Persian Gulf is a fair one. So far it appears to me, from every bit of data that we have that has been made available to us, that certainly it has not been very fair so far.

I have written a letter to Senator SASSER of the Senate Budget Committee outlining that data, and I am a member of that committee. We look forward to hearings next Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday which will examine much of the burdensharing issue. Unfortunately, the administration has so far said it is not going to come up and testify on that.

We heard yesterday that the reason the administration will not testify is that it does not really know what kind of commitments have been made by our allies for 1991. So there is nothing for the administration to come up and testify on. But certainly they could come in and testify on what happened in 1990, and come up and tell us quite honestly that the record on this is not very good.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that my letter to Senator SASSER outlining the best data that we could find on burdensharing, what our allies have committed, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, December 14, 1990.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to bring to your attention several concerns which I hope the Budget Committee will pursue during the forthcoming set of hearings on the costs of the Iraqi conflict. The American people and the Congress deserve a full accounting of the costs—direct and indirect, financial and political—incur by the Administration on behalf of the American people in pursuit of policy objectives in the Persian Gulf.

COSTS OF OPERATION DESERT SHIELD

As a first order of business, we must receive complete and authoritative information from the Administration on the costs of Operation Desert Shield. In September, the Department of Defense estimated that costs associated with Operation Desert Shield would total roughly \$15 billion in fiscal year 1991. As you can see from the table below, however, there is a large discrepancy between Pentagon estimates of the cost of the Gulf deployment and that of the Congressional Budget Office.

SEPTEMBER ESTIMATES OF COST OF OPERATION DESERT SHIELD

(In millions of Dollars)

	Fiscal year 1990			Fiscal year 1991		
	DOD	CBO	Dif-ference	DOD	CBO	Dif-ference
Airlift	484	484	0	2,240	148	-2,092
Sealift	336	336	0	1,560	34	-1,526
Other de- ployment	250	250	0	430	0	-430
Medical	30	30	0	50	8	-42
Operating costs	565	418	-147	2,520	2,664	+144
Reserve callup	215	168	-47	2,800	2,365	-435
In-theater support	295	250	-45	1,800	1,360	-440
Special pay	25	7	-18	60	85	+25
Total	2,200	1,943	-257	11,460	6,664	-4,796
Fuel (all DOD)	300	300	0	1,740	900	-840
MilCon	30	0	-30	1,800	0	-1,800
Grand total	2,530	2,243	-287	15,000	7,564	-7,436

What is the basis for the discrepancy between the Pentagon figures and those of CBO? Is DOD including in Desert Shield the cost increase for fuel DOD-wide? The Pentagon estimates nearly \$2 billion for military construction in Operation Desert Shield—for what? How are "in-kind contributions" accounted? Assessed?

President Bush's decision on November 8 to nearly double our forces in the Gulf region will obviously entail a significant cost increase. Estimates of the costs of the expanded scope of Operation Desert Shield now range to \$31 billion for FY91. Five weeks after this decision was made, however, we have not received any official statement of revised cost estimates. I certainly expect that such estimates would be available in time for the Budget Committee deliberations in early January.

ALLIED BURDEN SHARING

During September, the Administration secured commitments from various nations for cash and in-kind assistance towards the costs of Operation Desert Shield. A special account, the Defense Cooperation Account,

was established within Treasury to receive and disburse such funds. Of nearly \$9 billion committed, the U.S. received less than \$4 billion in cash contributions by the end of November, even as the U.S. was increasing its share of the burden of collective security in the Gulf.

Before the decision to nearly double our troops in the region, the U.S. constituted 57% of the troops in the coalition arrayed against Iraq. Allied pledges of nearly \$9 billion offset about 50% of the FY90-91 then-estimated U.S. cost of \$17 billion. With the addition of 200,000 troops, the U.S. share of forces will rise to nearly 75%, while our share of the costs of the allied effort will also rise to nearly 75%.

ALLIED CONTRIBUTIONS

(In billions of dollars)

Country	Commitment	Cash received	Total re-ceived
Saudi Arabia	3.0	0.76	0.99
Kuwait	2.5	2.25	2.25
Japan	2.0	.38	.43
U.A.E.	0.5	.25	.28
Germany	0.8	.27	.33
Korea	0.1	0	.01
Total	8.9	3.91	4.29

Military forces in the Persian Gulf through Nov. 16, 1990

U.S. Army	120,000
U.S. Marine Corps	45,000
U.S. subtotal (57 percent)	165,000
Saudi Arabia	38,000
Egypt	30,000
Syria	15,000
Kuwait	7,000
Other Gulf States	1,500
Arab subtotal (34 percent)	98,500
Britain	9,000
France	5,000
European subtotal (5 percent) ..	14,000
Other Moslem (4 percent)	11,500
Total (100 percent)	289,000

I find it incredible that those countries most directly affected by the threat posed by Saddam are not contributing a greater share of the ground forces. Nor can I understand the logic of having those who are most dependent upon Gulf oil, such as Japan, pay a disproportionately low share of the total cost of maintaining the free flow of that oil. Finally, many oil producing countries have reaped enormous windfall profits in the aftermath of the Iraqi invasion. How much of this is being channeled to support Operation Desert Shield?

IRAQ AND THE BUDGET

The Congress agreed last November not to count the costs of Desert Shield in the 1990 budget agreement. The Administration must, therefore, come forward in the new year with a supplemental appropriations request to cover the costs of Operation Desert Shield over and above the budget agreement cap on military spending of \$289 billion. If the estimates of \$31 billion for Desert Shield are correct, and if allied contributions total \$9 billion, the Congress will be asked to appropriate nearly \$22 billion for Operation Desert Shield—in addition to the agreed level for defense spending.

How does the Administration propose to pay for this? A special tax for Desert Shield? Further borrowing in international capital

markets? In spite of our efforts this year to curb the federal budget deficit, the Congressional Budget Office now predicts that next year's deficit will total \$320 billion. Will we be asked to tack on another \$22 billion for Operation Desert Shield? The Administration should include with its request for funds for Operation Desert Shield in FY91 a description of how it intends to pay for this "off-budget" function.

POLITICAL COSTS

In the course of the recent hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, Committee members rightly expressed broad support for the President's efforts in bringing together an international consensus and coalition opposed to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. At the same time, members also registered deep concern over the price the United States may have paid in securing continuing support of U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf.

Secretary Webb addressed this issue directly in his testimony of November 29:

"The President has assembled a broadly-based coalition of nations who agree on the narrow issue of Iraq's occupation of Kuwait, and who diverge on just about everything else. While these efforts are commendable, many Americans have become rather amazed at the lengths the Administration has gone over the past few months to keep the coalition together . . . The political and economic promises our Administration appears to have made in exchange for much of this support have yet to be revealed. And the price we may be asked to pay in terms of unspoken commitments could come back to haunt us."

We already know some of the costs of keeping this coalition together. We have, at the President's request, forgiven \$7.1 billion in military loans to the government of Egypt. President Bush reversed long-standing U.S. policy to meet publicly with President Assad of Syria, a nation still considered a terrorist state by the U.S. government. The Bush Administration has reversed political sanctions imposed on the People's Republic of China following the Tiananmen Square massacre by inviting the Chinese Foreign Minister to Washington. What other promises have been made?

I commend you for holding hearings by the Budget Committee on this important set of issues, and hope that you will find these thoughts useful in guiding the Committee's deliberations.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

TIMOTHY E. WIRTH.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, let me just briefly summarize some of what we found, and this is data we received from the Library of Congress and from the Congressional Budget Office through the Senate Budget Committee—not easy to find, I might add, because the administration has been very reluctant in providing this information. It is the best we have at this point. Let me give a sense of this.

This is at a time when the United States has about 90 percent of the combat troops in the Persian Gulf as part of the overall allied coalition; about 90 percent of those troops are American; at a time when we are spending this year \$288 billion already on our military, and the costs of Desert Shield are above that. The United States has made enormous commitments of young

people in the Persian Gulf, and made enormous commitments again of scarce national treasures to the defense capability which has been projected in the Persian Gulf.

The American taxpayer has already committed its young people, already committed its resources. In addition to the hundreds of thousands of troops and the \$288 billion in the Persian Gulf, in addition to that, Operation Desert Shield is costing us at least \$2 billion a month more. Some have suggested it is going to be as much as \$31 billion a year, probably more than that. That is assuming there is no shooting. If we begin hostilities, again the cost goes up very dramatically. In terms of the cost of ordnance, the cost of equipment, and so on, the cost goes up dramatically.

Even without hostilities, the extra cost to the United States for this force in the Persian Gulf is about \$30 billion. Of that, what kind of a commitment has come from elsewhere? From everything that we can gather, Saudi Arabia had committed some \$3 billion in cash. Of that amount, as of Christmastime, Mr. President, as of the middle of December, we had actually received \$750 million from the Saudis. And the total receipts, including in kind at this point, was a little less than \$1 billion.

The Kuwaitis, who are alleged to have vast amounts of reserves in Western financial institutions, hundreds of billions of dollars as has been reported, committed \$2.5 billion, and they had paid out almost all of that \$2.25 billion. The total amount that the Kuwaitis committed is \$2.25 billion. The United States is in it for \$30 billion.

The Japanese have committed \$2 billion. They said they would give us \$2 billion for this effort. The cash received as of the middle of December was \$380 million.

The United Arab Emirates committed one-half billion dollars. Remember, there is a vast amount of money flowing to them. And these are countries—Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates—who have had enormous windfalls as well, because the price of oil has gone up. They have made a great deal more money because the price of oil has gone up. The United Arab Emirates committed one-half billion dollars and have given us so far \$250 million.

The Germans committed \$800 million. They are much more dependent upon imported oil than we are; the Germans committed \$800 million, and in fact, we had received \$270 million of that commitment.

Ask yourself, what is going on here, Mr. President? Should we not be reaching out to other countries who are as committed and have as great a need as we do, and probably a lot greater: Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, the Japanese? We built this military machine at vast cost. Ninety percent of the troops there are American. Should they not at least be paying for it?

And what does the data show us?

The data show us that the contribution that has been made from our allies is, in the words of some of our witnesses in early December, disgraceful. I think one of the places where this debate is going to get joined most aggressively is when the American taxpayer comes to realize, when the emergency supplemental comes up from the White House—and it is going to be here—there will be an emergency supplemental, reported in the press, between \$22 and \$30 billion; that is for a peacetime Desert Shield operation, we are going to be asked to spend American taxpayers money of somewhere between \$22 and \$30 billion more. The American taxpayer will then say, "How much are the people we are saving, whose countries we are saving from the Iraqis, how much are they contributing?" They start to look at that, and they are going to see that the Saudis are paying precious little. The Japanese, dependent on Persian Gulf oil for about 70 percent of their energy economy, has committed a little bit of money; delivered much, much less. The German Government, granted with all kinds of commitments that they have and problems, unification of Germany and so on—we have problems, too, Mr. President—the German Government has contributed just a little less than \$200 million. The U.S. taxpayer is being asked again to pick up a huge load of the tab for countries whom we are protecting as well.

How much is Uncle Sam going to be our brother's keeper around the world militarily, financially, and now in terms of paying for all of this as well? That set of questions has not been focused on very much, but I believe it is the one that is going to come on so strongly and the American public is going to say, "Hold on. We are happy to be a superpower. We are happy to commit ourselves to a policy that is in our national interest, but we are expecting our allies to pay their fair share." And certainly our allies are not.

A final note, Mr. President. If we end up with an emergency supplemental of \$30 billion, which is entirely possible, I would remind you that we went through a budget debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate and on the floor of the House of Representatives, which was a very, very bloody budget debate, very unpleasant, very ugly. We came out of that saving about \$30 billion. We saved about \$30 billion going through all of that agony. The White House changed its economic policy, changed its readmy-lips strategy. We made some very significant cuts and we saved about \$50 billion going through all of that.

Most of that savings is washed out by the cost of Desert Shield, Mr. President, unless we can convince our allies that they have an obligation, particularly the Saudis, who have gotten this

enormous windfall, and the Kuwaitis with these alleged vast resources in Western financial resources. Just interest on that money alone could pay a lot of our cost. Where are the Japanese? Where are the Germans? Those are questions that I think our allies must be asked. We have to have this administration conducting the American foreign policy to be as aggressive in going after those countries as we have been generous in giving those photo opportunities to President Assad and bringing the Communist Chinese Government in out of the cold. Those questions are going to be a very tough part of this debate, but are questions that have to be asked, and our constituents are going to ask us those questions.

In closing, Mr. President, I again want to thank our colleagues who have brought the timing of this debate to the floor. It is terribly important that we do so. It is terribly important that we begin to open up the public discussion on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We have had excellent hearings in the committees. There are going to be more hearings next week in Judiciary, more hearings in the Budget Committee. We will have a vast amount of information. I think the American public will be ready for this kind of very important debate, and I hope we can agree upon a resolution on the Senate floor.

I hope what we come out with, Mr. President, is something that we can all agree upon. To have some kind of partisan gain is not to have any kind of a goal here. The goal is rather to assure that we come out with a unified national policy such as we had before the President changed it from the original three-point plan. We go back to that policy. It was successful, it was working, and it is one that I think would have the support and does have the support not only of the Congress but the American public.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I appreciate including that material in the RECORD and I yield the floor.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, every international crisis produces some predictable results, and one of the saddest is the spate of handwringing we always see here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Senators stand up, one by one, and compete to see who can come up with the longest list of reasons why the United States is wrong, why the United States should not take any decisive action, why the United States is powerless.

I can remember, not too many months ago, when I offered some amendments suggesting that Iraq's leader, Saddam Hussein, was a pretty dangerous character; and maybe we should not be subsidizing his tyranny and torture with American taxpayer dollars.

If I wanted to embarrass some of my colleagues here, I could dig up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that debate, and read back some of the statements my colleagues made on that occasion.

I will not do it.

But let me tell you one thing: That does not mitigate in Saddam Hussein's favor because, Mr. President, he is not a nice guy. I could list a whole lot of things that he is—but let me get to the bottom line. He is a tyrant and murderer. And he justly deserves the name of the "Butcher of Baghdad."

I wish Secretary Baker all the luck in the world. But Saddam's flunky, Mr. Aziz, is not going to listen to Jim Baker's arguments. And even if he passes them back to Saddam verbatim—or Secretary Baker himself ends up in Baghdad speaking directly to Saddam—I do not think it is going to make any difference.

Maybe I am wrong; I hope I am wrong. If it can bring peace, without our goals achieved, it is worth it. But I do not think it is going to happen.

The man is a tyrant and a murderer. He went into Kuwait with his eyes wide open and his goals clear.

He wants to run the Middle East. He wants to control our oil. He wants to wipe Israel off the face of the map.

He saw the road to achieving those goals running right through downtown Kuwait City and he sent his troops; in fact, let us call them what they are, not military troops but uniformed terrorists. He sent them in to achieve those clear goals. And he is not going to pack up and go home voluntarily, certainly not easily.

I doubt that he is going to pack up and go home at all unless we send him a clear message.

Mr. President, it is not George Bush who is the bad guy. Some would begin to think that is the case when we hear the kind of debate that we have been subjected to. Let us not lose track of the fact it is not George Bush who sent troops in murdering, marauding; it is Saddam Hussein.

It is not the Constitution of the United States which is at stake.

We have used military force a couple of hundred times in our history without a declaration of war and we still have a democracy, and we still have a constitution. And, thank God, we still have our freedom.

The issue here is not the Constitution. The issue is vital, bottom-line, long-term, live-or-die American national interest.

Saddam Hussein must be stopped, and turned back, and punished. Let us quit this handwringing. Let us do what we ought to do. Let us not bash Bush; let us back him.

I do agree with some of the handwringers on one count. I agree that Congress should act. Let us get off the sidelines, off our duffs, and act. We are

an American Congress. Let us act for America.

Let us vote today, up or down, on a resolution endorsing what the U.N. Security Council said. Does anyone here remember who voted for that resolution in the Security Council? Can we do less than they did?

Ethiopia voted for it. Malaysia voted for it. Venezuela voted for it.

Ethiopia is still willing to say to Saddam Hussein that you are the bad guy and you have to get out of Kuwait, and we are prepared to punish him with "all necessary means" unless and until he does.

If Ethiopia has the guts and the common sense to say that, it seems to me that the U.S. Senate should equally have some, but we do not. What gives?

Yesterday, ABC News released a poll that said 70 percent of the American people think that the Congress has not given the President enough support. To me that poll means one thing. Some politicians around this town have been able to fool 30 percent of the people into thinking Congress is doing its job the right way. The figure criticizing us should not be 70 percent, it should be 100 percent.

We are a disgrace. We have hundreds of thousands of young men and women in Saudi Arabia who may soon be asked to risk their lives. I think the 100 of us here ought to be willing to risk our standing in the next Gallup Poll by having the guts to vote. So I say let us vote but not on these sideshow handwringing issues. Let us vote on the real issue. Do we back up American policy, the American President and, most of all, the American men and women doing their jobs in Saudi Arabia or do we not?

Let me make two final points. One, this is not just an American show, and it better not turn into just an American sacrifice. If anyone, if any country makes a nickel of windfall profits from a war in which thousands of Americans may lose their lives, well I cannot even think of a word to describe how tragic and disgraceful that would be. Here we have the Japanese dangling \$3 billion in aid in front of Saddam Hussein, saying if you get out of Kuwait it is yours, it is \$3 billion.

In New York we call that bribery, and it is not legal. Internationally I call it an obscenity. If Japan has \$3 billion to pony up—and let us face it, that represents pocket change in Tokyo these days—there is one place, and only one place, where that money ought to go. It ought to go to support Operation Desert Shield, period, end of argument.

West Germany is going to give the Soviets multiple billions in aid. Maybe they will help the Russians build some new highways so their tanks will have a smoother ride when they drive into the Baltics. Billions into the Kremlin's coffers, billions that ought to go into

protecting Germany's critical economic interest in a stable and secure oil supply, billions that ought to go to Operation Desert Shield.

That is just one thing. But the last, and most important thing is this. I do not want it, and I do not like it, and no one does, but the likelihood is that there is going to be war. When we get to that stage then burden sharing gets to be pretty simple to tally up.

Real burden sharing is going to be measured in terms of body bags. When the shooting starts you find out who your friends are. When the shooting is over you remember. I hope we have the sense, and I believe we will, to maximize our chances to achieve our goals while minimizing the loss of American life.

To me that translates into very heavy reliance on those areas where we have the clear advantage and where Saddam has the clear disadvantage. We spent billions and billions over the years to develop a devastating air war capability. If the flag falls, I hope we will use it for all it is worth. I am not interested in bombing Saddam back to the stone age. I am just interested in bombing him back into Iraq with the smallest possible risk to American lives.

Mr. President, this is the highest stakes game we have been in for many, many years. Let us treat it that way—here in the Senate and over there in the Persian Gulf. Let us do it right—here in the Senate and over in the Persian Gulf. Let us make America proud—here in the Senate and over in the Persian Gulf.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMMS. Mr. President, I compliment my friend from New York. He has been one of the stalwarts in the U.S. Senate since the beginning of this, who has tried to remind the Senate that in order for a President to carry out foreign policy, and for that foreign policy to be successful and save the lives of Americans, it is necessary that we stand together and are unified behind a strong position.

Some may say that the Senator is rattling sabers on the Senate floor. But I think if we want to send a message to Saddam Hussein, my message to Saddam Hussein is: Go home, resign, go into exile. This man is a threat to the security of the region, and that, in turn, is a threat to the security of the world.

I shudder to think of what kind of a situation we will be in 3 or 4 or 5 years from now if all the handwringers have their way and Saddam Hussein survives, develops nuclear weapons, and then starts blackmailing people with the threatened use of those nuclear or chemical weapons in major cities or ports throughout the world.

I do not want to see conflict or combat any more than the Senator from New York does. But our leading, first President who spoke on this said: If we want peace, prepare for war.

Mr. D'AMATO. I wonder if the Senator will yield for a question?

Mr. SYMMS. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. D'AMATO. Does the Senator from Idaho have any doubt that if Saddam Hussein were about to go nuclear, that Israel would launch a preemptive strike to keep that from taking place?

Mr. SYMMS. You mean go nuclear against Israel? I would hope that any country that thought that Saddam Hussein was going to threaten Israel with the use of nuclear weapons would take preventive measures to stop them from being able to do so.

Mr. D'AMATO. I share that view.

Mr. SYMMS. The scenario suggested by the Senator from New York would probably be the case. I think the question is, Do we want to leave a situation where we might trigger a war between Arabs and Israel at a later time, that could lead into a much more vicious war than any we currently face? There is a good chance that if the United States does use its military air power and air superiority in the currently pending conflict, it could be a very, very quick and decisive action.

Mr. D'AMATO. I wonder if the Senator shares this concern? It bothers the Senator from New York that, indeed, if Saddam Hussein is permitted to keep that incredible military capability, his chemical weapons, the delivery systems, and the emerging nuclear threat, that sooner rather than later we will face the inevitable conflagration that we have worked so assiduously to avoid between the superpowers. And that indeed Israel will be forced to take that preemptive action, the action she took in 1981 when she destroyed the nuclear reactor.

I remember following that action the silence on the Senate floor and in the Halls of the Congress. There were very few who came and stood up and said Israel did the right thing knocking out that reactor. I remember on June 10, 1981, that morning, I commended Israel. There were not many other voices commending them. As a matter of fact, people were saying: My gosh, why did they do this? Saddam Hussein was not trying to attain any nuclear capability for war purposes.

I just say I have that concern. It is apparent that the Senator from Idaho shares the same concern.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New York, when he made that commendation of Israel at that point in time, was proven correct some years later than Saddam Hussein started using chemical weapons on some of his own people that were not loyal to the war he was waging against Iran. So I think the Senator has proven

quite correct in his long-ranging vision that saw Saddam Hussein as a threat to that region.

We hear a lot of people talking here, and I do not impugn the motives of any of my colleagues, but I believe there are two points I would like to make today. First, President Bush in my opinion has used enormous restraint. He has had every provocation, as Commander in Chief of the strongest, most powerful, and the best trained military on Earth, to exert some use of that military force. He has used extreme prudence and he should be commended for that, in my view. The Senators in this body should commend him for his prudence.

He had every reason—our people were held hostage, young children in Kuwait were brutalized, extreme violence was committed, and American lives and property were put at risk—President Bush has had every reason to use military force. He has the power at his disposal to be effective with a minimum loss of life of our people and a maximum deterrent effect on the Iraqis. So I think we should give him commendation for his prudence in withholding use of that power as long as he has.

Second, I think we should remember that however this plays out and however it ends—and I hope like all other Senators it could be done with a minimal use of military force or no military force at all—but if it ends up that Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi military-industrial complex are still in place in the region, even if they leave Kuwait, the region will not be stable and it will not be safe.

At a minimum, we need to neutralize Saddam Hussein and his military-industrial complex. The ideal way to have that happen would be to have him withdraw from Kuwait when they realize that they are up against a military superior force, that they cannot survive it, and then we let the people in Iraq take care of the problem, dismantle their war machine, stop their efforts at manufacturing chemical weapons, start producing goods for the people. But in the real world it may not happen that way.

The message that this Senate should leave was well expressed in the speech that our colleague from Wyoming, Senator WALLOP, gave right before we adjourned last fall about the reason. He argued it would have been healthy for the United States and the Congress to have been on record early on in support of what the President has done.

I have not seen the President committing troops to combat. He has great restraint. I had the opportunity to visit Saudi Arabia with the Senator from New York and with the distinguished Republican leader and other Senators, along with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. We were briefed then that the air war and gaining superiority of the skies totally,

including the absolution of their ability to use ground-to-air missiles, would only be a matter of days, only hours for the air part and days for the rest of it. We have used great restraint. I think the people of this country and of this Congress should give the President some credit for the restraint he has used.

But I cannot say anything critical of the military for getting themselves prepared to do whatever it is the President thinks he might want them to do. They have the flexibility now. The forces are in place. I believe we can be successful if it does have to go to combat or go to a heavy position, to a position of using military force.

I just want to, again, compliment my friend from New York for his insight, his vision, his sense of understanding of that region of the world and what is happening in the gulf. I think that it is important for the American people to know that the reason we are there is to neutralize Saddam Hussein, his military-industrial complex so that we can see peace in that region of the world hopefully for many years to come.

Mr. President, I thank the leaders for their indulgence.

I thank my colleague, and yield the floor.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREE-
MENT—LEGISLATION RELATING
TO THE PERSIAN GULF

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during today's morning business, Senators may only introduce legislation relating to the Persian Gulf and that of the four forms of legislation available, the legislation must be in the form of a Senate resolution; that upon introduction, the Senate resolution will be appropriately referred to the committee of jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open today until 8 p.m., or until the close of today's session, whichever occurs later, for the introduction of resolutions relating to the Persian Gulf, entered under the previous agreement, and statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no bills or further resolutions, other than those permitted under the previous unanimous-consent agreement just agreed to, or committee-reported legislation, other than those whose introduction and consideration have been agreed to by the majority leader, following consultation with the Republican leader, be in order prior to January 14; and I further ask unanimous consent that beginning January 14 and for the remainder of the 102d Congress, Senators may be allowed to bring to the desk bills, joint resolutions, concurrent resolutions, and simple resolutions for referral to appropriate committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of today's session, the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, January 8; that upon the completion of business on that day, the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 10; that upon the completion of business on that day, the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. on Monday, January 14.

I further ask unanimous consent that with the exception of January 14, all of the Senate's sessions referred to in this consent be pro forma only, unless the consent is vitiated by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if I might at this moment explain the process and procedure to be followed pursuant to these several agreements.

First, as I indicated yesterday and earlier today, I have had and have no objection to Senators introducing resolutions relating to the Persian Gulf. The proposed consent agreement of yesterday, which would have prohibited that, was in accordance with a practice followed from time to time in past Congresses and with respect to which Senators had received written notice over a month ago.

Had I been aware prior to yesterday's session that any Senator wished to introduce a resolution, I would have, of course, been prepared to and would have accommodated those Senators.

Upon learning during yesterday's session that some Senators wished to introduce resolutions relating to the Persian Gulf, we began a process of developing these consent agreements through consultation with the distinguished Republican leader and several of our colleagues. And as a consequence now, as we notified Senators during the discussion yesterday, Senators will be able to introduce Senate resolutions relating to the Persian Gulf today until 8 p.m. or until the conclusion of today's session, whichever occurs later.

So Senators who were advised yesterday of the likelihood of this occurring now should be aware that this has been agreed to.

With respect to the other two consent agreements, they provide that at the conclusion of today's session, the Senate will recess until next Tuesday at 10 a.m. That will be a pro forma session.

When the Senate completes its business on that day, it will go into recess until 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 10.

This agreement gives me the authority as majority leader to vitiate the pro forma aspect of the proceeding and to permit other business to occur following consultation with the Republican leader.

I now announce that I have consulted with the Republican leader and it is my intention to exercise that authority to permit the swearing in of the newly appointed Senator from California, Senator SEYMOUR, assuming that all of the necessary paperwork has been completed in time for such swearing in. That would occur next Thursday at or about 10 a.m.

I also have advised the distinguished Republican leader that in accordance with my previous statements, both privately and publicly on numerous occasions, we will review the situation with respect to the introduction of further resolutions on the Persian Gulf, debating and voting thereon, following the meeting between Secretary of State Baker and the Foreign Minister of Iraq, Mr. Aziz, that we now understand will occur on Wednesday.

Therefore, there is at least a possibility—and no decision has been made, but I merely want to advise Senators of what I have privately told the distinguished Republican leader—that we would then come into session, that I would further use this authority granted me to begin formal debate on the subject matter of the Persian Gulf, the various resolutions, or at least begin the process of proceeding to such debate, on next Thursday at 10 a.m.

I have not made such a decision, will not do so until I have further consultation certainly with the distinguished Republican leader and with others of my colleagues, but I merely want to alert Senators that that possibility does exist for next Thursday.

In addition, under this agreement, we will be in regular session on Monday, January 14, at 10 a.m., and pursuant to this agreement Senators will then be allowed to bring to the desk bills, joint resolutions, concurrent resolutions, and simple resolutions; in other words, the process which we had originally intended as of last fall in planning this year's schedule, the process which we had intended to commence on January 23 will now commence on January 14, and we will be in session at that time.

I would like to ask the distinguished Republican leader if I have left anything out or if he has any comment as to whether I have correctly stated the position as we understand it.

Mr. DOLE. If the majority leader will yield, it has been accurately stated. I appreciate if the papers are in order we will be able to swear in the newly appointed Senator, Senator JOHN SEYMOUR, on Thursday, January 10.

Is it the understanding of the majority leader that on January 14, which is a Monday, we would be in session Monday and the balance of that week; is that correct?

Mr. MITCHELL. It is impossible now, of course, to foresee what will transpire between now and then, but that certainly appears to be likely, if not probable, at this time given the events with respect to the Persian Gulf.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the majority leader. I think it is accurate and correct. I appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of the distinguished Republican leader and of our other Senate colleagues to permit us to proceed. I should add to the distinguished Republican leader that possibility of being in full session also exists with respect to the previous Thursday.

Mr. DOLE. Good.

Mr. MITCHELL. Although that would not be bill introduction time, that is, we could be in session with respect to the Persian Gulf situation as of 10 a.m. on Thursday. So really we are talking about any time between Thursday and the following Monday. On that, of course, I have not made a decision, will not make a decision certainly, as I said, until I talk to the distinguished Republican leader again and we see what happens on Wednesday.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has a 5-minute statement. I have about two or three statements that will take maybe 20 minutes. I ask that following his statement I may be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas will be recognized after the Senator from Rhode Island, without objection. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Chair. I thank my friend and colleague from Kansas.

NO PREMATURE WAR IN THE GULF

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, 11 days from today the United States could be at war.

January 15 is the U.N. Security Council deadline for Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait and the President has made it clear that he may use the armed forces of the United States anytime after January 15 to accomplish the United Nations objectives.

I cannot estimate the cost of such a war but I do know that American casualties would be in the thousands and the material cost would be in the billions. In my view, this price is too high to be paid at this time. Moreover, there is every reason to believe that the current U.N. economic sanctions imposed on Iraq will work. Last month our Foreign Relations Committee heard testimony that the sanctions have produced a 50 percent drop in Iraq's GNP. This is three times the impact of any other economic sanctions this century and 18 times the impact that experts say is necessary to accomplish the political objectives of the sanctions.

As a result of sanctions, Iraq cannot sell oil and has no source of revenue. It can perform no international financial transactions. It cannot produce tires for its transport. It cannot operate its expensive entirely imported industrial infrastructure. It cannot replace its aircraft, its tanks, its artillery. It cannot obtain the parts to keep all this equipment functional. It may soon be unable to refine aviation fuel and essential lubricants. Even its currency is imported and in the coming months, its paper currency will wear out. Sanctions are running Iraq's economy into the ground.

And even if the sanctions do not force Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait, they will certainly weaken his military capabilities. Before asking our young men and women to die for the liberation of Kuwait, we must at least be sure that every possible alternative has been tried. So far this has not been the case. And, if we must go to war, I want to be sure that our men and women face the weakest possible Iraqi enemy. If we go to war now this will not be the case.

At most, 5,000 Kuwaitis have died since the August 2 invasion of that country. A war to liberate Kuwait would certainly kill many more Americans than this number. And it certainly would involve many more Kuwaiti deaths than have occurred so far. Let us not destroy Kuwait or thousands of young American lives in a premature effort to save Kuwait.

Saddam Hussein is an evil man. More than 2 years ago I compared him to Adolf Hitler, an aggressive dictator willing to use poison gas on his own people. And for more than 2 years I helped lead an effort to sanction Iraq for its use of poison gas against the

Kurds and for its blatant disregard for international law. I cannot help but point out that my legislative efforts to stand up to Iraqi aggression and law-breaking were strenuously resisted by many of those who are today so eager to commit our young men and women to battle.

Iraq is an international menace and it must be compelled to withdraw from Kuwait. My disagreement with President Bush is one of tactics not goals. I firmly believe that time is on the side of economic sanctions, that time is on the side of the United Nations, that time is on the side of the United States. And I desperately want to give our young men and women in the Persian Gulf all the time they need.

In conclusion, I wish Secretary Baker success in his mission abroad this coming week. I know how hard he has tried to bring this whole affair to a successful conclusion and pray that peace will be preserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island question the presence of a quorum?

Mr. PELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE RULES CHANGE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, very briefly, just to call attention to what happened on the House side yesterday—normally we do not call attention to what happens on the House side, but I think it is important, for some of us, in effect, who had sweat and blood on the budget agreement last year thought we had an agreement passed by a bipartisan majority in both bodies. It was rather frustrating to see that the House Democrats made their first move to dismantle the spending restraints that are in the package. The budget agreement clearly and decisively makes the Office of Management and Budget the official scorekeeper. The majority party in the House has decided that the Congressional Budget Office alone should keep tabs on congressional spending. It seems to me that is like putting the inmates in charge of the institution.

One of the biggest breakthroughs of the budget agreement—and many of us said that is why we could vote for it—was we would finally have spending restraint, and pay as you go. If you could not pay for the program, you were not going to have a program. A lot of us took a lot of heat, a lot of criticism for tax increases and other things in the budget. We said, well, it is worth it be-

cause we will have some discipline when it comes to entitlement programs or new spending programs. If we give such a program an increase, we have to find some offsets so far as the cost is concerned. If the expenses cannot be covered, cuts in other entitlement programs became mandatory, and there would be a process called a "minisequester."

According to the budget agreement, we all voted on it. Many of the Democrats in the House who voted on it yesterday voted to change the rules, which seems to be rather inconsistent at best. But now we are trying to turn this pay-as-you-go process upside down because now we give the scorekeeping job to the Congressional Budget Office, which is under the control of the Democrats. What they will do is give some rosy scenarios and underestimate the costs, and it seems to me that we are right back where we started.

I must say it just seems almost unreal that this would happen 3 months after the budget agreement, and, as one who spent months working on the budget agreement, it seems to me at best it is an act of bad faith. I think it is fair to say that we will do all we can to prevent any changes being made in the U.S. Senate.

The President has vowed to veto any legislation containing Congressional Budget Office or Joint Tax Committee cost estimates.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who voted for the budget agreement, who voted for spending restraints, who voted for pay as you go, will help block this shameful and underhanded move to rewrite the budget agreement.

Mr. President, I know my colleague, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], who was largely responsible for some of the key provisions in the budget agreement and, because of his credibility and his work, led many of us to support the final package, is on the floor. I would be happy to either yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico or yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Republican leader and my good friend. I do not need him to yield the floor for long.

I just want to indicate that I concur wholeheartedly with what he has just said, and I would like to put in the RECORD a letter which I mailed on December 27 to all of the leaders, both Democratic and Republican, in this body and in the body next door regarding this issue.

I ask unanimous consent that letter be made a part of the RECORD as if read.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, December 27, 1990.
Hon. GEORGE J. MITCHELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: The House Democratic Caucus recently approved a rule that will be considered by the full House next week. This rule significantly undermines this fall's Budget Agreement. While this would be a rule of the House, it holds important implications for the work of the Senate and the recently concluded Budget Agreement.

I object strenuously to the adoption of this House rule.

The House Democratic Caucus rule would require that all direct spending and revenue legislation considered in the House of Representatives include as a statement of law the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate of that legislation. Since all revenue legislation must originate in the House—and since revenue legislation would normally be used for pay-as-you-go legislation—this rule would directly influence any pay-as-you-go legislation considered in the Senate.

This issue was discussed and debated at great length during the conference on the Budget Agreement. I was directly involved in those discussions. It was fully recognized by the conferees that in order to make the categorical sequester process work constitutionally, the final authority of costing legislation must lie with the Executive Branch. You will recall that this issue was addressed in the 1986 Supreme Court's ruling in *Bowsher v. Synar*.

The conferees were well aware of the arguments that the Executive Branch might abuse this power, although this power has existed since the 1986 Supreme Court's decision. The conference report directly spoke to the issue:

"The conferees urge the Congress to scrutinize the scorekeeping of the Office of Management and Budget as that Office implements the procedures under this conference agreement. The conferees considered procedures under which Congress would enact into law Congressional Budget Office cost estimates as part of any spending legislation. Should the Office of Management and Budget abuse its scorekeeping power, the conferees believe that the Congress should adopt such procedures at that time" (H.R. Report 101-964, p. 1172).

In addition to recognizing the issue, the Budget Agreement put in place various procedures that require both CBO and OMB cost estimates to be produced in conformance with scorekeeping guidelines determined in consultation among the two Budget Committees, the CBO, and OMB. Further, within five calendar days after the enactment of any direct spending or revenue legislation, the OMB must transmit to the House and Senate a report containing the CBO cost estimate, the OMB cost estimate, and an explanation of any differences.

But overriding this is the fact that the House Rule undermines the credibility of the entire Budget Agreement. I need not tell you the hours spent in reaching that agreement. In the end, compromises were made on both sides. This House Rule is a serious breach of the Budget Agreement—and a negative reflection on our ability to govern.

Since I feel so strongly about this issue, I am informing you and the Republican Leader that should the House Rule be adopted—and legislation is then presented to the Senate with this directed scorekeeping—I will be compelled to raise a point of order, pursuant

to section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act, against any legislation that includes directed scorekeeping. Section 306 specifically precludes the consideration of legislation dealing with any matter that is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. Scorekeeping procedures are directly within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee.

I am looking forward to working with you and the Republican Leader during the new Congress.

Sincerely,

PETE V. DOMENICI,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I predicted in that letter that the Democrats in the House, by caucus and by rule change, would undermine a significant portion of the bipartisan budget agreement, an agreement in law that said the Congress would not conduct the business of budgeting for new direct spending and revenue legislation this way. I said they would do it because it serves their purpose to have the Congressional Budget Office do the work rather than the agreed-upon Office of Management and Budget. Sure enough, the House adopted such a rule. They did not even change the law. They did not even change the agreement. They just changed their internal rules.

Everyone should know that this action violates the spirit of one of the most significant understandings of the budget agreement—the pay-as-you-go principle. Hopefully, this provision will go nowhere because it still has to be considered by the Senate. I can guarantee you, if someone else does not, this Senator will raise a point of order against such legislation. Then the proponents will have to get 60 votes rather than a simple majority of Senators to approve this kind of maneuvering.

Second, such legislation would have to be signed by the President. I hope that just on principle alone he will veto any new program that is allegedly paid for by new taxes scored by the Congressional Budget Office instead of the Office of Management and Budget as required in the budget agreement. We just cannot go through months of negotiating and then have one body, one group, the Democrats in the House, decide, "We will do it our way, and not the way we agreed upon."

The December 27 letter that was made a part of the RECORD outlines the serious ramifications of the House action for the bipartisan budget agreement.

Mr. President, pay as you go is a brilliant concept. It simply means that if the Congress is going to have a new program of an entitlement nature for the people of this country, it must pay for it. It is a pretty good concept. I think the American people support it. Congress said let us pay for such new spending requirements. If we do not pay for it, we said, let us cut programs automatically through what we call a minisequester to offset these new

costs. That is what this issue is about. A minisequester would cut everything a little bit to pay for new programs if Congress does not do what it committed to do. The House, however, would like a new method of scoring, a new method of deciding whether they have complied with the pay-as-you-go requirement or not.

I thank the distinguished Republican leader for raising the issue and for yielding to the Senator from New Mexico so that I, too, might warn the Senate that this may be the first step in unraveling an unprecedented 5-year deficit reduction package. There are many other good provisions left in the budget agreement. Maybe the House will try to do away with them one at a time. This is the first step, the first provision done away with unilaterally by one party through a change in the House rules, to alter the budget agreement.

I thank the Republican leader, and I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer. I thank also the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his usual clarity and, I think, firm statement on what is or what will be the approach in the U.S. Senate.

TRAGEDY IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we are hearing a little bit about the tragedy in El Salvador. I guess most eyes are focused on the gulf crisis. We forget sometimes, at our own peril, that the rest of the world continues to turn, sometimes with tragic results.

Yesterday, three American military personnel died in El Salvador when their helicopter was shot down by FMLN rebels. There is no dispute about that. The FMLN proudly claims credit for the death of these three Americans. There is, moreover, some very disturbing evidence that as terrible as these deaths are, in any case we might be dealing here not with a tragic act of war but a deliberate case of murder.

For there is some evidence, still being investigated by both American and Salvadoran authorities, that at least two of the three Americans were alive after their helicopter crashed—but were subsequently executed by FMLN gunmen.

Mr. President, let us wait for the results of that investigation before we make up our minds about what really happened. But let us now face, and deal with, some clear facts.

Last year, the Congress of the United States, because it wanted peace, gambled on the good intentions of the FMLN. I happened to believe then that it was a lousy gamble.

In light of what happened since, I now know it was. Anyone who looks at the facts must know that, too.

Last November, sadly, we all heard speech after speech on the Senate floor,

criticizing the government of President Cristiani and the Salvadoran military—and totally ignoring the real source of the violence and turmoil in El Salvador, the FMLN.

Last November, we heard one request after another to give the FMLN a chance to demonstrate its intentions; to use the term then heard so often, to "Give peace a chance."

It might be instructive for all of us to take some time to review the record of that particular debate. But the bottom line is: Last November, we held out every incentive we could for peace in El Salvador—even at the cost of punishing our ally, the democratically elected Government of that country. We gave both sides a chance to show their true stripes.

Last November, a few weeks later, the FMLN did. It launched a massive and bloody offensive. Hundreds were killed, and thousands wounded.

Mr. President, this week, the President must decide, under the terms of the legislation we passed, whether he should release the balance of the military aid for El Salvador we withheld, as an incentive for peace. That act—punishing the Cristiani regime, and implicitly rewarding the Communist rebels—turned out to be not an incentive for peace, but a green light for FMLN treachery and aggression.

Mr. President, I hope the President does decide to release the balance of the Salvadoran aid, not because we want to encourage more violence, but because failure to do so under the tragic circumstances that prevail may again, inadvertently, send just the wrong kind of signal, with just the wrong kind of result. Not peace and justice; but violence and treachery.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have a certain sympathy for both sides in the spirited discussion which took place on the Senate floor yesterday. I strongly supported the effort of the majority leader to establish some realistic guidelines on how we proceed to debate and vote on the critical issues of the Persian Gulf.

These are critical days—days in which events and decisions could produce a peaceful resolution of the gulf crisis, or could propel us into war.

Let us just stop and think for a moment. The President, just yesterday, made one more proposal for a peaceful resolution—proposing that Secretary Baker and Iraqi Foreign Minister Aziz meet.

Happily, the Iraqis have today responded positively, and a Baker-Aziz meeting will take place next Wednesday. No one knows what, if anything, those talks can accomplish. But do we not have a responsibility to wait and see? Do we not have a responsibility to give Secretary Baker a chance to deliver his message to Aziz, or to Saddam, or whoever—without having that message distorted, or drowned out by

the conflicting voices of a hundred Senators, here on the floor?

"Give peace a chance" has achieved cliché status. But it has real, concrete meaning in this situation.

Let us give the President's peace initiative a chance. Let us not inadvertently compromise, or kill it, by engaging in a bitter and divisive debate that—for all its good intentions—will almost certainly be misunderstood by Saddam.

We can debate all we want to about our constitutional rights and powers and responsibility—but is it not also our responsibility—as Senators and as Americans—to act responsibly by giving this last, best hope for peace a chance?

Having said all that, though, let me say again: I am also sympathetic to the frustration that is being expressed that the Congress is not doing its job. For months, we have been standing on the sidelines, making all kinds of speeches—but taking no responsibility and not casting a single vote. Congress has not voted yet on anything with reference to the Persian Gulf.

Yesterday, an ABC-Newsweek poll indicated that 70 percent of the American people believe the Congress has failed to provide adequate support for the President. I will bet that number goes even higher in the next few days and weeks.

The American people are dead right.

While the President has been providing the leadership a Commander in Chief must provide; while our young men and women have been sweating it out in the sands of Saudi Arabia; while even the United Nations has mustered the will to take strong and decisive action—Congress has been AWOL.

The American people do not like that. And they are dead right.

I have been hammering away at this point for weeks. Throughout November and December, I called for a special session—just so Congress could debate, and if necessary vote, in those days when our policy was being formulated. I felt then, and I feel now—we have a responsibility to do more than cheerlead, or second-guess, or wring our hands.

We get a salary from the taxpayers to do a real job. This is a democracy, and we do have differences of opinion on exactly what the proper constitutional role of the Senate is. But I do not think that any Senator believes we have been elected, and are being paid, just to make speeches.

We are here to do a job; when necessary, to stand up and be counted; to take responsibility. So, again, while I suspect I disagree in substance almost totally with the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Washington, I share, to some degree, the frustration they displayed yesterday.

And I also believe that we are proceeding from the same basic motive—

not only I, and the Senators from Iowa and Washington; but all of us in the Senate.

We do not want war. We want peace.

You cannot look into the faces of those young Americans—men and women—in Saudi Arabia, without thinking about the personal dangers and challenges each of them will face; without thinking about their families—their fathers and mothers, their spouses, their young children; without imagining their fears and anguish.

We all want peace.

Our disagreement—and it is a real and sincere one—is how do we minimize the chances for war? How do we maximize the chances for peace?

In my view, there is only one chance to achieve a peaceful resolution. Somehow—somehow soon—we must convince Saddam Hussein that he will not succeed, he will not achieve any reward, for his aggression. We must somehow deliver to him, loud and clear, the message that the United States and the world will not tolerate—it is not rhetoric, or a bluff—his continued savage subjugation of a sovereign nation, which directly threatens vital American interests.

That bottom line is not a matter for compromise, or negotiation. He will be thrown out of Kuwait; American vital interests will be protected—one way or another.

He must get that message, and he must believe it is credible.

Secretary Baker will try to deliver that message next Wednesday in Geneva, and we all hope and pray that he will succeed.

But the record to date strongly suggests that, if Saddam Hussein has any doubt, if he has any straws to grasp, if he perceives any wiggle room, he is just not going to give in.

I do not make predictions, but I would hazard a guess if he does not give in on this basic point there is going to be a war. People are going to be killed. They are going to be Americans, and there are going to be others.

We are getting very close to an endgame. We cannot turn the screws any tighter on sanctions. Frankly, over time, the leaks in the economic embargo now in place are going to turn into gushers.

We cannot realistically expect any more international and U.N. support than the extraordinary display of unity which we have already amassed. Oh, we will have differences on burden sharing but, as I said yesterday at a meeting, if we are concerned about burden sharing when it comes to dollars, what will we say if there is a war and how many Americans are killed and how many Egyptians and how many were wounded and how many Saudis and how many others?

There really is not any basis to believe that the sanctions, or anything else, will erode Saddam's military ca-

pabilities, or make him an easier target, any time in the near future. Again, I do not have much reliance on polls conducted but this same ABC-Washington Post poll shows that now 25 percent of the American people said we ought to go right now; 57 additional percent said we ought to maybe wait a month. That is 82 percent of Americans polled said give him 30 days, no more. So those who are advocating sanctions of 1 year, 18 months, they just missed out altogether. They have to know we are not going to have a coalition in 18 months. We are not going to have any support in 18 months.

Every day that we wait Saddam Hussein digs in deeper. Every day he has the capacity to build up his forces even more. And we must face up to the bottom line truth. Once we get to the point where we have our forces in place a chilling fact settles in. Every day thereafter that we wait, Saddam Hussein's capacity to kill and maim more and more American troops grows. There is no doubt about it. Every day we wait after that point our casualty list probably grows.

We have waited more than 5 months. Does any Senator want to stand up and make the case that Saddam Hussein's capacity to kill American soldiers or terrorize Americans around the world has decreased one iota in all those 5 months or 150 days? Does anybody want to make that claim that somehow we are better off? That he is not better prepared. That he is not dug in more deeply? Can anyone give a compelling reason backed up by real facts that his capacity for death and destruction is going to deteriorate in the weeks and months ahead?

What is it going to be? Everything and everybody is in place. To send the right message to Saddam Hussein the strong stand of our President, our Armed Forces, the sanctions and unprecedented action, and now the Baker-Aziz talks, everything and everybody is in place, I should say, except the Congress of the United States.

Maybe it is too late to avoid war. I hope not. But candidly I am not certain. But I am certain of this: If we do have a war, it is not because George Bush, or the United States, or the United Nations did not try hard enough to avoid one. It is not because our side, and our side happens to include practically everyone in the world except Saddam Hussein, it is not because our side did not show enough patience.

It is for one of two reasons: that Saddam Hussein was going to have "his" war regardless of what anybody did, Congress, President, anybody else, United Nations, or because he somehow, despite everything, has failed to get the message of American unity, resolve, and strength.

I cannot guarantee, and no one can guarantee, that a strong expression of congressional support for the U.N. ac-

tion to date, for President Bush, and most of all our troops in the gulf will succeed in penetrating Saddam's obviously rather dense cranium.

But do not we have the responsibility to at least try?

The Iraqis now try to make the case that, in a meeting with the American Ambassador just before their invasion, they got the idea America would not "take sides" in an Iraqi-Kuwaiti dispute.

I happen to believe it is a pretty bogus argument, but it is a case they are trying to make. And without suggesting for a moment that there is credibility in the proposition that they somehow perceived a "green light," how do we know for certain exactly what messages they do take from what we do? And does it not make sense, in this critical period, to be especially prudent and judicious in all our actions and words?

Someone in our S-407 briefing yesterday asked Secretary Baker a very good question. The question was: "How do we really know how Saddam reacts to what is going on, either in the gulf, back here, or anywhere else? How good is our intelligence?"

I am certainly not going to detail the Secretary's answer, but I can assure you of this: No one can be certain exactly what information Saddam receives or how his thought processes work.

But there is strong evidence that he pays an extraordinary amount of attention to what is going on in this city, and in this building, and in this Chamber, and in the other Chamber, known as the House of Representatives.

Does anyone here want to wake up tomorrow and find in some postmortem on a war that some well-intentioned action or complaint here in the Senate has been totally misunderstood in Baghdad and has given Saddam the idea he could drag things on a bit longer?

That does not mean we do or say nothing. It does mean that just as President Bush has gone the extra mile in our dealings with Iraq, we should go the extra mile to assure we do not send the wrong message to Saddam Hussein.

And if at all possible, it does mean we should join the President and the rest of the civilized world in sending the right message to Saddam.

That is the best way to maximize the chances for peace. That is the best way to minimize the chances of war. And that is the best way to meet our responsibility, both to the Constitution and to the young men and women who now stand watching and waiting in the sands of Saudi Arabia.

So I would say to my colleagues on both sides, this is a very difficult question for all of us. Many of us had combat experience. Many of us have been in World War II, or Korea, or Vietnam. We know what happens, and we know

there are losses. We know that there are casualties. We do not want that to happen again, not to one American.

I would hope we could find some way, some way, and I am pleased to say that the majority leader and I are working with others trying to figure out maybe there is some consensus resolution we could pass so that nobody misunderstands that we are united. There is not a single Senator who, as I understand it, has any quarrel with the objectives stated by the President. We may have a different way to achieve those objectives. Some may prefer sanctions. Some may prefer to wait a month, or 6 months, or a year. Others may want to use force immediately.

But I think we understand that what we really want, and what President Bush wants, and he reiterated it as recently as a couple hours ago to me personally, is to find a peaceful resolution.

As he said yesterday in a meeting with a number of us who were present on the floor, he would like to have our help. He would like to have Congress go on record supporting the concept, or at least the concept of the U.N. resolution, which would authorize the use of force if necessary unless there is complete withdrawal from Kuwait.

I have been outspoken, and I have made statements I assume that maybe did not please the White House, but this is too important, as far as I am concerned, to try and please anyone except our conscience, the people we represent, and the young men and women in our States and other States who are loading up and headed off and are already on the sands of Saudi Arabia.

The more I think, and it seems to this Senator that there may be a feeling on President Saddam Hussein's part that we are not united. We are united. Our purposes are the same. We agree with the objectives. We are a democratic country. So we are going to have our differences. Some may be partisan. There is nothing wrong with that. But he should understand that statements may be made on the Senate floor, off the Senate floor, somewhere in the public way, that may reflect that person's view at the moment but has no bearing on what I believe is the overall unity in the United States of America.

I just urge my colleagues, and there may be others who have better ideas, I would urge my colleagues, or challenge my colleagues, let us find some way this next week.

You know the 15th is coming very soon. I think we are a little mixed up. We should have been debating in November and December. We ought to be maybe quiet this next week when Secretary Baker is meeting with Aziz, but that is history. But maybe we can find a consensus that a substantial majority on both sides of the aisle who support that would send precisely the right message that would support the

President's intentions and what he hopes will be a peaceful resolution of this Gulf crisis.

I know that efforts are underway by some to do that. Efforts are underway in the other body to find some consensus. Maybe it cannot be done. Maybe some, frankly, want to take issue with the President. It is not unparalleled.

I have been reading a little history on U.N. resolutions and the War Powers Act. In 1950, the tables were turned. We had a Democratic President and a Republican Senate. And Republicans were giving Truman a hard time. So nothing has really changed. We were the ones making the arguments then about the U.N. charter and constitutional rights and prerogatives and the power to declare war. But President Truman did not listen. He committed troops, and then he consulted.

While we may have a very difficult choice, so does the President of the United States. There are many here who say "Well, we do not care if he uses force. We want him to come up here first and get our approval." The more I think about that, the more I do not understand it. Unless it is going to be open ended, and I do not think many in this body want to give any President any open-ended authority.

I voted from the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. I have been here that long. I know how it was distorted. And, I might add, I offered the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution as a Member of the Senate; I think a freshman Member of the Senate.

But how do we couch language which in effect supports the President and still satisfies many of those in Congress and many of those in the Senate who would say before any force is used the President will come to us for authority? And is a declaration of war what we want in this purpose? Is it something less?

There are a lot of reasons, maybe other than legal reasons, you might want to think about that for awhile.

But in effect we say that if the President says well, we are going to have to use force, and he comes to Congress and says "I am going to have to use force. I need your approval." Do we not tip off Saddam Hussein to get ready we are going to attack? What happens to the element of surprise? And how many more Americans do we lose, how many more wounded; and how many more Egyptians and Saudis and other allies, British and French and others?

So, yes, we have a very difficult choice. But so does the President of the United States. And there are enough good minds in the U.S. Senate on both sides of the aisle that I would hope that by the time January 14 rolled around, which, according to the majority leader's unanimous-consent request just received, we will be back in session, and maybe by that date we could agree on a resolution and vote on it

that date, the day before the 15th. What a message that would be to Saddam Hussein. If we cannot agree, then we will have our debate, as we should have.

So again I will say, in conclusion, if any of my colleagues have any brilliant ideas—and I am certain there are some around—maybe we can all sort of work together in an effort to protect our rights and our responsibilities and at the same time make certain Saddam Hussein understands that we are unified in purpose and that we support the efforts of the President of the United States.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Kansas on a wonderful speech, which I appreciated. There is a need for new ideas.

One thought that has gone through my mind is if we ought to ask the Secretary General for his good offices, because at this point we are pursuing U.N. resolutions and we have not really had a hearing or had much communication with him. I believe he tried in August but was frustrated. I hope maybe out of this exchange the thought would occur that we should not only accept his good offices but ask him for them. I believe this conversation would be helpful.

Mr. DOLE. If the Senator will yield, I recall yesterday the Senator from Rhode Island raising that with the President. I do not know whether it is a direct result or not, but I think the President is going to be meeting tomorrow with the Secretary General of the United Nations, so I think it has already taken root.

Mr. PELL. I believe that has occurred. But I do not think the thought has occurred that we ought to not be bashful but should ask him for his good offices because he may not want to do it at this time.

Mr. DOLE. But it was a U.N. resolution, so he might have a responsibility.

Mr. PELL. Exactly. I hope he is conscious of that responsibility.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Republican leader. I have had the privilege of working with him for some time on this issue and of having joined with him and others for three consecutive consultative meetings with the President of the United States. I have witnessed first hand the leadership and advice that he has given the President; indeed all those critical meetings have been constructive exchanges of views.

We are fortunate, not only in the U.S. Senate, but fortunate in the United States of America to have men with the qualifications of ROBERT DOLE whose experience with military affairs stretches all the way back to World War II when he shared, first hand, conditions on the battlefield, and the risks and sacrifices of those who participate in conflict. And indeed we are fortunate

the President of the United States likewise has experienced firsthand conflict. He knows the meaning of the loss of life. It is that experience that must be brought to bear on the crisis in the gulf where we are asking today men and women of the Armed Forces to face those same risks that previous generations of Americans have willingly and courageously shown, as we have defended freedom not only for this country but for our allies.

This indeed is a complex issue and one which I am confident this body will at some time address and address with great care. I think yesterday the decision by the majority leader and others that the debate on the gulf should be deferred until such time as the Secretary of State returns is a correct one. The majority leader yesterday displayed the tough, determined leadership we will need to search out a constructive, hopefully supportive, role for this body. This body had an opportunity, following the U.N. resolution, to consider a special session. This Senator aligned himself with Senator DOLE and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] at that time publicly stating that we believed it was the proper time for consideration by Congress of the gulf issues. But, as Senator DOLE said, that is history. But history is a teacher. And now we have to call on all those lessons of previous conflicts as we face a complex situation, unlike any other, facing our President and all Americans.

I am hopeful that our President, working with the other leaders of this world, can solve this situation without conflict. But I commend our President for putting in place a very credible deterrent against further aggression and a credible military force and diplomatic effort to back up the U.N. resolutions.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I intend to speak only briefly today because I believe, as the distinguished Republican leader has commented earlier, that it is very important to examine carefully the results of the meeting between Secretary of State Baker and Iraqi Foreign Minister Aziz, which will occur on Wednesday. Today's debate has been important as the start of Senate consideration of the issues related to the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

I will comment only on the constitutional issue of war powers. I would suggest that it is imperative that the Congress of the United States express itself, either yes or no, on support for the President's use of force in the Persian Gulf.

The constitutional balance is a very delicate one. On the one hand, the Congress has the sole authority to declare war. Contrast this with the President's authority as Commander in Chief. The President has occasion to act on his own in cases of emergency, but on the

matter at hand there has been adequate notice to the Congress as to the factual context. So if the Congress is to remain silent in this particular instance, it seems to this Senator that we would significantly erode, if not virtually eliminate, our constitutional authority and responsibility under the war powers clause of the Constitution.

Beyond the constitutional issue, in a representative democracy, it seems to this Senator that we have the responsibility to speak out. Each has been in contact with our constituents in a variety of settings—open-house town meetings, speaking at high schools, and talking to people at all levels of our society.

It seems that we are on a course now where there will be adequate opportunity to take up the issues of the Persian gulf on the merits. The hour is late. It is past 5 o'clock on a Friday afternoon and there are other Senators who wish to express themselves, so I shall limit my comments to the constitutional implications.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming, the majority whip, is recognized.

Mr. SIMPSON. I do appreciate the way that was handled by my friend from Pennsylvania. He has kept his word with me for 10 years. And I think that is a remarkable record. He said 3 minutes, and I believed him, and it was so. The Senator from Pennsylvania is a man I greatly admire and enjoy. He is a man who has followed this issue, sometimes to his own personal detriment. I found out what that was like, too, when I visited in April with Saddam Hussein, and also with Foreign Minister Aziz.

It was a very interesting discussion in Mosul, Iraq, in April of last year. We had a delegation of five, including our fine Republican leader, BOB DOLE; Senator McCLURE, our absent brother from Idaho; my friend FRANK MURKOWSKI; and my friend from Ohio, Senator METZENBAUM.

It was, as you might imagine, a very interesting 3½ hours with Saddam Hussein, and also a long visit with the Foreign Minister. We also traveled to Syria where we visited with President Assad. Very fascinating things were said there which later came swiftly to fruition, specifically the invasion of Kuwait, and then the United States response and the U.N. response in August.

I have listened to the spirited comments and the activity yesterday as our majority leader attempted to go forward with the business of the Senate. I can understand fully the intensity of my friend from Iowa, TOM HARKIN, and my friend from Washington, BROCK ADAMS. These two people have spoken on this issue for many, many months. And they feel very strongly

about these issues of constitutional law and the War Powers Act.

But it is my thought that that is not what is at issue here. The issue I think we should deal with is the issue of the United Nations and the resolutions passed there. It seems to me that is being lost somewhat in this process.

Let me say first that I think the joint leadership of the House and Senate, Democrat and Republican alike, has done a superb job in trying to handle the congressional aspects of the issue that was precipitated when we were out of session, and involved in an election year. I happened to be in the election as a candidate, as was the occupant of the chair, and we know, I think, the feeling of the people of our States as they talked about this issue in October and early November while we were seeking their favor.

It is a difficult enough thing. It is filled with a mixture of patriotism, fear, anguish of Vietnam, pain, pride, humanity, reticence—it is a great conflict and one of the toughest things that I have ever been involved in in 25 years of public life. But I think that the President, President George Bush, has done a superb job of handling this crisis precipitated when Iraq invaded Kuwait on August 2. If there is one strength of this President it is his ability to work with and consult with others, and not just a facade of attempted cooperation. He actually says: What do you have in mind? What is your view of this? What do you think we should do?

It is not just some offer or overture to get a response which would then not be heeded or listened to. He has worked in consultation with other world leaders on a tireless basis. He and Secretary Baker, who know each other so well, do such an excellent job with their form of diplomacy. And then my old friend, Dick Cheney from Wyoming, my colleague for 10 years in the Congress. There is no one with a more extraordinary and broad grasp of the power and authority and government than this man. And then, Colin Powell, with his extraordinary abilities and his marvelous ability to convey the seriousness of the situation and still keep that grand good humor of his in a tough, tough situation; Brent Scowcroft, the steady, extraordinary technician and military man. This country is well served by those people. And the Vice President has done a splendid job with his activities in carrying out the mission of his President. These are very important, competent people who we are fortunate to have involved.

I do not think in my 12 years here I have seen more extraordinary people holding the reins of power in what is certainly one of the most vexing things to confront us in many, many a day. But I think it is good, and in my remarks, which will be brief—I do not know how many more wish to speak under the unanimous-consent agree-

ment, but certainly this is the time to do that—I say this debate is going to take place. No one should believe that it will not.

It is rather absurd to believe that we would go forth into this extremely serious situation and not have this debate in this body and on the floor of the House of Representatives and the floor of the Senate. We will have that debate. We will have a very spirited debate, as was evidenced here yesterday and has been evidenced in the spirit of the debate in other forums like the electronic and print media.

We will do that. Yet I cannot be any more sincere in feeling that nothing good will be accomplished by anything we do before the meeting of Secretary Baker and Foreign Minister Aziz. Nothing. Our Republican leader has already signified that Saddam Hussein is quite transfixed by this activity. He watches it. He is watching it now. It would be a good opportunity to send him a greeting of some kind, and the best greeting to send him would be that even though he does not understand a lick about democracy, and I can assure you that that is the truth, and he never will, I think under any circumstances, he at least ought to know when we have our scraps in here, finish our work, do our debates, and sometimes it is heavy and sometimes it gets pretty rambunctious, that this country has always, always come together.

Sometimes we have come together in a very extraordinary and yet limited way, as was the case in Vietnam, but it is what could have happened with the Japanese in the Second World War. We traded with them—people forget what had occurred. They knew that Congress was debating whether ever to do anything militarily appropriate. The diddling and the waffling went not just through Congress but went through all agencies of the Government: They felt we would not do anything; we would not want to fight. Who does?

I was in the army infantry at the tail end of the army of the occupation of Germany. I was not in combat. I did not meet a lot of people who were lusty for combat. I met a lot of veterans of the Second World War who were still in uniform. Nobody wants that, and we are not seeking that. But it is extraordinary to me to see now, as we do, people continually talking of war. The media talks continually of war. I have seen commentators almost look saddened at the prospect of extrication, extracting ourselves from this without conflict. And then you do them on that and they seem to blanch a bit and go limp, but they do talk about war all the time.

You would think that on January 15 all of the red buttons would be pressed and we would be going to war. That is not the case. What an unfortunate scenario to set out and foist off on the American public. And that is unfortu-

nate. I have often said, and I say it again sometimes to my own detriment, that the role of the media and journalists in a free society is to educate the public, not to just excite them. I have often said, too, that if the purpose of the evening news is really news, then why pay them as if they were entertainers? Somebody has to start making that distinction. I made it long ago.

These are the very same people who are able to earn extraordinary honoraria without accounting to the public. What is their conflict as they speak to groups for 20,000 bucks a pop or 10,000? And you will not get them to report what groups they spoke to and then write about them. Is that a conflict? You betcha it is. And they then continue to knock on those of us in the Congress as to how ineffectual we are, how we do not do our duty and they enjoy, thank you, a continual denigration and pulling down of a remarkable group of men and women who do get together to do the Nation's business and, thank you, do it quite well.

You would not know that in the last moments when we left this Chamber in October. It seemed that the whole debate was simply one of "the rich versus the poor." What an interesting thing! While we were passing legislation that had to do with the Clean Air Act and housing, honestly dealing with the farm bill for the first time in history, seeing how to get a handle on the tremendous aspects of subsidized agriculture and do it in a thoughtful way, you would have thought we just kind of diddled around and stumbled out of town without doing anything for 2 years. That is very unfair and untruthful representation.

So I would like to keep that creative tension restrained. I think that is good to do because certainly there is a responsibility of a responsible press to responsibly educate the American public and not to just see how much of a spoonful of hype and hoorah and hyperbole they can feed them on an instantaneous basis to get them all jazzed up and anguished and full of fear for the entire space of the day—at one per hour.

There must be more to it than that, unless they are here only for entertainment. And then we should just call them that—entertainers and forget the four letter word "news."

The United Nations is really functioning for the first time in its history. It is meeting the mission that everyone had for it, or at least the vision and the mission that most people had for it. They have adopted 12 resolutions on this issue of the Persian Gulf since the Iraqi invasion in what surely must be an unprecedented show of united world response to brutality, aggression, and lack of respect for the rule of law. That has never happened before. We never envisioned such a unique accord, and

now we have it. I think that gets totally lost in the shuffle.

In response to this growing threat against Saudi Arabia and to a request that was communicated to our Secretary of Defense by King Fahd, of Saudi Arabia, our President has ordered this particular presentation of force and ordered these forces and these air defense units to this part of the world. They are stationed there as a deterrent against further Iraqi aggression and to provide defense, if necessary.

There are 200,000 troops from other countries in this area, and yet you would think, if you continued to watch and listen, that we were the sole people there; that it was solely the issue of blood versus oil, which is a simplistic and grotesque transformation of reality. There is much more to it than that. Much more, indeed. It is called other countries; it is called brutality; it is called torture; it is called abuse; it is called aggression. The President called it in the clearest term used, "naked aggression."

So here in this place in the world that all of us are riveted to, we find troops from Egypt and Syria and Morocco and France and Britain. We find military support or assistance from Australia and Bangladesh, Belgium, and Canada, and Denmark, and Greece, and the Gulf Cooperation Council and Italy and Japan and The Netherlands and Nigeria and Norway and Pakistan and Senegal and Saudi Arabia, the Soviet Union, Spain, Turkey, and West Germany, and many of those countries are sending a perhaps token military contingent or limiting their assistance in recognition of their own constitutional strictures against overseas military deployments.

There is a reason why Japan cannot respond in this instance. We put it in their Constitution when we conquered them in the Second World War. That is a reality. That is why the Japanese cannot function in any further way to assist us. But they have done very well, and I continue to be appalled at how we do say, "They have done little or nothing." They have done 4 billion dollars' worth of something, \$2 billion in cold, hard cash and \$2 billion in kind. They are ready and consistently willing to do more and they will. They have indicated that.

NATO now has announced that three member States will help to provide their defense to Turkey. We must be very careful there. How long will Turkey remain one of our staunchest of allies when they have some turmoil in their own government with certain ministers and other officials who have resigned apparently because of decisions of this fine President of Turkey who has been such a reliable and remarkable supporter of ours. The important factor here is the broad support internationally for containing Iraqi ag-

gression. So we find that world opinion is united for the first time in my memory at least in condemning the actions of a foreign leader, where the factions that would usually be there and the people on his side would blunt the totality of the repugnancy toward him. He does not have that. It is unprecedented to have as united a response as what we have seen to this action. I think the President deserves our support and appreciation for his leadership and his hard work. I think it is encouraging to observe the way it is being handled by the rest of the world. World leaders are talking, consulting together, meeting, working to defuse the situation.

Again, it is my personal view the United Nations should be taking the lead to see that we can reach this goal and I still very much believe we can reach it—peaceful accord.

We just cannot respond to Iraq with unilateral actions, however dearly we might wish to. I do not think the American people would want that and world opinion would certainly turn on us in extraordinary ways.

And so we go forward. We will debate this in this place. We will do that. That is our duty. None of us have ever shirked it or wanted to avoid it.

We set a recess when we left here in October. We did not want a lameduck session. Those are always abusive and unproductive. Now we are on call. We are in session. I admire the majority leader and the minority leader for the method in which they have brought us to this point. It is a very sensible and serious way to address it.

One final note. We talk of sanctions. Sure, I want to see sanctions work. Who does not? No one. Economic sanctions yet are but one aspect of the international community's response which also includes a diplomatic isolation of this aggressor, combined with a credible threat of the use of force.

What will happen on January 15 is not red button day. What will happen on January 15 is that we will go back to the U.N. resolution, and the language of it says "such as is necessary." It does not talk about war. It is but another string in the bow, along with many other options as to what to do in this extraordinary situation.

So healthy debate about our goals and just how to achieve them is going to take place. But it must not undermine, or be perceived to undermine, the international coalition that is arrayed against Iraq. That at some time will not remain as solid as it is. That is the nature of the beast in the Middle East.

So we must be clear in that debate about how to achieve our ends without appeasing Saddam Hussein's aggression. It must not be done in a way that will lead him to believe that the international coalition will hesitate to use force if he fails to comply with the

U.N. resolution. This is not the U.S. resolution.

I think conflict is not inevitable at this point, but the credible threat of the use of force must be part of our strategy. It is the one thing that this man understands. The President has continued and will continue to pursue these diplomatic options and to seek all possible means of assuring peace. He has currently forwarded one more diplomatic initiative in saying that he would send this fine Secretary of State to meet with the Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz in Geneva. That will be done. Until that final diplomatic initiative has been given a chance to awaken Saddam Hussein to the realities of the situation—and I do not believe and I share with others that he has not received the full load as to what is up and what is arrayed against him, we should not be talking as if war were inevitable and hostilities imminent but he will understand what we are saying.

After that initiative has been done and given a chance, if it appears to have yielded no positive results, then will be the time for us to debate and to ratify and to endorse the actions authorized by the United Nations, and I think for the United Nations to act once again through its fine Secretary General. The United Nations was set up and conceived to function just as it has in this crisis, to be a forum of international debate and enforcement of international law. That body has functioned with unprecedented skill and speed and near unanimity and force in condemning Iraq's actions and in authorizing concerted international response.

Should the Baker-Bush initiative meet with further intransigence, and perhaps even ignoring of the mission and the message, then we will need to evermore focus our attention as a legislative body and a nation on endorsing and supporting and encouraging the actions of the United Nations.

It is the United Nations that has authorized the use of force, as necessary, if Iraq does not comply with its resolutions by January 15. It has not mandated such force, nor has it made the use of force inevitable.

So perhaps we could stop talking as if support for the President and for the United Nations were some blanket authorization for the use of force. That is truly misinformation of the highest order.

Let us not tie the President's hands, which would certainly give encouragement to Saddam Hussein and undermine the functioning of the United Nations. Time for debate of this magnitude is not now. The time will arrive soon enough.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for approximately 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today earlier I introduced a resolution regarding the Persian Gulf and Operation Desert Shield in response to the concerns shared by many Americans that Congress exercise the utmost care to send a signal to Saddam Hussein that the United States resolve to enforce the resolutions of the U.N. Security Council remains firm.

I share what I know to be the concern of all Americans over the risk of war and the loss of American lives incurred in our determination to confront Saddam Hussein's naked aggression in the gulf. I have experienced war. I have experienced war and have witnessed the loss of life, and understand the potential futility of committing precious resources to destruction. Mr. President, we must give peace every chance. We must give international negotiating efforts every chance. And we must all hope that world political and economic pressure will be sufficient to force Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait.

But, Mr. President, we must be unmistakably clear that the United States is steadfast in our determination to reverse Saddam Hussein's brutal imperialism. We must not give the impression that we are questioning our fundamental purpose for opposing Saddam or for deploying military forces as part of Operation Desert Shield.

I believe President Bush and his administration have performed brilliantly in constructing an unprecedented diplomatic, economic, and military response to Iraqi aggression. The President deserves the widespread support and appreciation that he has received for the clarity, prudence, and efficacy of his policies. He has acted forcefully, but wisely.

The United States deserves the admiration of the world for having the courage of our convictions that international law regarding the sovereignty of nations must be respected. And we have earned the world's appreciation for our devotion to the creation of another, better world based on respect for international law and the lawful resolution of disputes between nations.

The United States is in the gulf because world order cannot be based on hope and good intentions alone. We have seen conflicts in the developing world cost the lives of millions, and

produce over 10 million casualties and refugees since the end of World War II.

This is the moment, and the gulf is the place where we may well determine for a generation or more the nature of the post-cold war world. If we do not stop Saddam now, the new world order will be defined by the proliferation of regional conflicts, the establishment of regional superpowers, and the transformation of the international arms race into a worldwide race for weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. President, we are in the gulf to defend the U.S. vital strategic interests, not to lower the price of gasoline. If Iraq's aggression stands, Saddam will control some 20 percent of all the world's proven oil reserves—roughly six times all the proven oil reserves in the United States.

More than 60 percent of all the world's proven oil reserves could come under the de facto control of a ruthless dictator. We cannot predict precise consequences of such domination, but they could mean trillions of dollars in added world oil costs over the coming decades. That development could pose a lasting and devastating threat to our ever more interdependent global economy by making the development of Third World nations a near impossibility.

President Bush, to his credit, has organized more international support for peaceful alternatives to war than any other leader in contemporary history. In a period of months he has led us out of the cold war and to the revitalization of the United Nations as an effective force for defending international law. He deserves the support of the Senate for his efforts.

I have introduced this resolution to provide the Senate the opportunity to show our support for the President, for international law, and for the creation of a better world order. It does not call for the use of force nor preclude the pursuit of other means for obtaining our objectives in the gulf.

This resolution recognizes the manifest culpability of Saddam Hussein for the crisis in the gulf, the threat that his aggression poses for the United States and the world, and the necessity of clear, concerted international opposition to his aggression. It supports a just and meaningful peace in the gulf, the diplomatic initiatives the President has undertaken, and the goals of Operation Desert Shield. It further urges the U.S. Armed Forces to continue to develop plans to achieve a quick and decisive victory in the gulf should force be judged necessary to achieve our purposes.

The purpose of this resolution is to let Saddam Hussein know that the United States is united in its determination not to allow his aggression to stand, and in its dedication to creating another better world of free nations, at peace with one another and devoted to

the rule of law. I strongly urge the Senate to adopt it.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

DEPLOYMENT AND USE OF U.S. FORCES IN THE PERSIAN GULF

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I am pleased to receive administration assurances that 11th hour efforts are continuing as it attempts to reach a settlement in the Persian Gulf without resorting to the use of force. Any breakthrough on the subject of face-to-face meetings between Secretary of State Baker and Iraq's Foreign Minister Aziz would be a very encouraging development.

There are also some promising signals emerging from the diplomatic community that Iraqi leaders are pulling back on their claim that Kuwait is now part of Iraq. Past Iraqi rhetoric on this issue seems to be softening. Apparently, the message that we mean business is finally getting through to Saddam Hussein.

I am not convinced, however, that the administration has abandoned its belief that war is inevitable. This troubles me greatly. In a matter of months, the American people have been told that what started out as a defensive deployment of troops to protect Saudi Arabia suddenly—and without a great deal of explanation—has changed to an offensive deployment of troops with an objective of forcibly removing Hussein's army from Kuwait.

I supported the President's decisive action to send U.S. military forces into the Persian Gulf under the auspices of the United Nations. This served as an immediate deterrent against Saddam Hussein's army marching from Kuwait through Saudi Arabia and beyond.

However, when I took the Senate floor on October 3, 1990 to express my support of the President's initial response to the Iraqi aggression, I also stated that in approving these actions, I wanted to make clear that the Congress was not authorizing President Bush to initiate offensive actions in the Persian Gulf region. "At this point in time," I said, "our presence in the region is solely for the purpose of defense and deterrence." That is still my belief as I stand addressing my colleagues here today.

My position has been and continues to be that the use of force should never be a first-choice option. With time on our side, I believe the U.N.-sponsored sanctions are the best weapon we can use to accomplish our objectives peacefully and without resorting to war.

Furthermore, the situation in the Persian Gulf must not be seen as an American problem alone. It must be seen as a U.N. problem to be solved jointly by nations in league with one another.

Stated more simply, it's time for other nations to step forward and equalize the risk and commitment to the objectives at hand. The financial and military burden of troop deployments in the Persian Gulf must be broadened even further to include the involvement of all nations united against a ruthless and unprincipled dictator.

Also, it is important to note that in a crisis of this magnitude, this is the first time in the history of the United Nations that we've had a unified view of what must happen in the Persian Gulf. Achieving our objectives peacefully, even if it takes longer, is always preferable to a military action and the accompanying bloodshed and anguish of war.

Concerning the constitutional issue of who has the power and responsibility to commit our Nation's troops to war, I wish to reiterate what I said on October 27, just prior to the adjournment of the 101st Congress. At that time, Mr. President, you will recall that I took the floor of the Senate to urge the administration to follow the letter of both the law and the U.S. Constitution in matters pertaining to the use of force in the Persian Gulf. I noted that Congress and the President share the common objective of restoring the territorial integrity of Kuwait and removing Saddam Hussein from a position of power in Iraq.

However, I also reminded the President that under our Constitution, it is Congress and Congress alone that has the power to declare war. On matters such as these, we must act on the basis of consensus—shared commitment and shared responsibility. To do otherwise, I believe, would be a very, very grave error on the part of the administration.

Mr. President, we should not shrink from the use of force. But war is not our only option, and the use of force should never be a first-choice option. Furthermore, I want it understood that I cannot support any action that unnecessarily or prematurely commits American soldiers to offensive military operations wherever world conflicts may occur.

What's the rush? Sanctions and diplomacy are working. I believe they are the best weapon we can use to accomplish our objectives without resorting to war.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I believe we should stand behind these sanctions while we vigorously pursue every possible diplomatic avenue to achieve a peaceful resolution to the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A PEREZ DE CUELLAR MISSION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, time is running out for peace in the Persian Gulf. As of January 15, hostilities could begin either through an offensive action to liberate Kuwait initiated by the multinational force or through an Iraqi preemptive attack.

It is therefore critical that we use the 11 days remaining before the January 15 deadline to try every conceivable path to peace. Yesterday at the White House meeting I urged President Bush to ask U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar to undertake a final peace mission. I have spoken to Secretary of State James Baker about this idea and a few minutes ago spoke to the U.N. Secretary General.

The Secretary General is the representative of a world community united in its determination that Iraq withdraw from Kuwait. While the Secretary General cannot negotiate the terms of the U.N. Security Council resolutions, he can fruitfully discuss the modalities of Iraqi compliance. If Iraq is looking for a way out of the current impasse, and for its own sake as well as the world's sake I hope it is, then such a Perez de Cuellar mission can be productive.

I am pleased that our President will be meeting with Secretary General Perez de Cuellar tomorrow. I hope this discussion may produce a further peace mission.

In August, Perez de Cuellar went to Jordan and there met with the Iraqi Foreign Minister. At that time he saw no purpose in further diplomatic efforts because of Iraqi intransigence. The situation now is fundamentally different. In August Iraq apparently doubted the world's determination. Now there can be no doubt, and I hope a Perez de Cuellar mission will provide a further chance for peace, a chance which all concerned may hopefully seize.

THE PRESIDENT MUST USE HIS VETO TO ENFORCE THE BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, the adoption by the House of Representatives of a rule to impose Congressional Budget Office scorekeeping on all money bills originating in Congress reneges on the budget summit agreement of last November.

The November agreement called for the Office of Management and Budget to perform the scorekeeping on all money bills, as would be consistent with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings process of sequester. This scorekeeping agreement represented an important and hardfought compromise.

As my colleagues know, this Senator was not a supporter of the budget summit agreement. I could not support anything like it that imposed the larg-

est tax increase in American history at the very moment when our economy was in the first quarter of a recession.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, there were some good features in the budget package that we adopted. In particular, there were new caps on the outlays that seemed to give us some hope the budget process would be less of a playground for gimmicks and evasions. I am very sorry now to realize that the Congress is attempting to regain some latitude for the gimmicks of the past.

Today I must stand before the Senate and say how sad I am that we adopted a tax package and failed, essentially, to adopt any spending reductions that will materialize in the next 5 years. The budget summit agreement of last November has a very, very close resemblance to the agreement that President Reagan was encouraged to adopt in 1982. A very large tax increase has been enacted, in exchange for empty promises of spending reductions.

President Bush has indicated he will veto any bills that violate the budget summit agreement by means of the use of CBO scorekeeping. I applaud the President's statement.

Indeed, I want to encourage the President to take this occasion—the use of his veto powers to stop the excess zeal of Congress to spend money and enlarge the deficit—to use his constitutional line-item veto to claim the right.

In article I, section 7, the Constitution says:

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary * * * shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

It is clear to this Senator, Mr. President, that the requirement that "Every Order, Resolution, or Vote" applies as a specific reference to every section and subsection of a money bill considered by this Congress.

The practice of packaging dozens or even hundreds of separate appropriations together in massive continuing resolutions and omnibus appropriation bills in order to give the President only an "all or nothing" choice, in order to nullify his veto powers, is not what the Founding Fathers intended. It is not what the American people should tolerate.

I strongly urge the President of the United States to take charge of this situation and use his constitutional power as Chief Executive and hold the House of Representatives to the letter of the budget agreement of last November.

TRIBUTE TO JIM MERRILL

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, North Dakota has lost one of its shining lights. James Merrill, former president of Lutheran Social Services in my hometown of Fargo, passed away last month. In February 1990, his human service program called FRIENDS was selected by President Bush as the 61st Point of Light. His efforts contributed to the creation of the Hospice of the Red River Valley in 1979. Merrill also developed the TOUCH Program, Techniques for our Understanding of the Community Handicapped.

As Fargo's daily newspaper said in a December 21 obituary:

Mr. Merrill was a leader in the area of services for people in need, and developed programs and services that reflected his concern for others.

A former social worker and teacher, he spoke across the Nation at conferences, schools, churches, and service organizations.

James Merrill was a true humanitarian and wonderful communicator. He will be greatly missed by his family, friends and everyone who ever had the opportunity to hear him speak.

TERRY ANDERSON

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to inform my colleagues that today marks the 2,120th day that Terry Anderson has been held captive in Lebanon.

In every newspaper we read about the crisis in the Middle East. We think about it. We talk about it. As we should.

But where are the articles about the hostages in Lebanon? Is it not intolerable that these men remain captive? I ask, Mr. President, that whether or not the media emphasize the plight of the Americans held in Lebanon, we keep them and their families in mind throughout the coming weeks as we contemplate this crisis and debate the appropriate United States role.

TRIBUTE TO DELSIE HOLMQUIST

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, a fine woman quietly passed away last month, just a few weeks before her 93d birthday. A residence hall on the Moorhead State University campus in Moorhead, MN, is named for this scholar and educator. Holmquist Hall reminds students and faculty of the great contributions Delsie Holmquist made to education in the Fargo-Moorhead area.

After receiving degrees from Colorado College and the University of Chicago, Holmquist moved to Moorhead in 1929. She continued her studies at the University of Chicago and the University of California at Berkeley. She served as a professor of English for many years before switching to humanities. Holmquist was named dean of

general studies in 1957. She chaired the Minnesota State Advisory Committee on Teacher Education for several years and served on the Minnesota State Arts Council.

After retiring from MSU in 1966, Holmquist taught literature at North Dakota State University in Fargo, ND. She proved that she still had a great deal to contribute by establishing NDSU's first humanities program and serving on the planning committee for NDSU's first honors program. She retired from NDSU in 1982.

For more than 35 years, Holmquist shared a house in north Fargo with another fine woman, Catherine Cater. These women were wonderful friends, and I remember them making many phone calls for the Democratic-NPL Party in North Dakota.

I also recall Holmquist's great knowledge of author F. Scott Fitzgerald and his work. She met his test for a first-rate intelligence, holding two opposing ideas in her mind at the same time and still retaining the ability to function. Her contributions will live on forever.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

FISHERIES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 1

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which, pursuant to 16 USC 1823, was referred jointly to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, as amended (Public Law 94-265; 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada on Fisheries Enforcement, signed at Ottawa on September 26, 1990. Under the Agreement, the United States and

Canada agree to take measures to ensure that their nationals and vessels do not violate the fisheries laws of the other party. This Agreement will improve enforcement of U.S. fisheries laws in the U.S. exclusive economic zone and will reduce risks to human life and safety caused by fisheries enforcement incidents on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 4, 1991.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Pursuant to Public Law 101-466 (H.J. Res. 682), the enrolled (parchment) copy of the following bill was signed on today by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD]:

H.R. 5835. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 4 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1991.

(A hand engrossed copy of H.R. 5835 was authorized by H.J. Res. 682, presented to the President and signed by the President on November 5, 1990, and designated as P.L. 101-508).

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CRANSTON, and Mr. SANFORD):

S. Res. 8. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress must approve any offensive military action against Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. Res. 9. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate concerning U.S. Military Forces in the Persian Gulf region; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. Res. 10. A resolution relating to the contribution by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to offset the economic impact of operation Desert Shield; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 8—RELATIVE TO CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF ANY OFFENSIVE MILITARY ACTION AGAINST IRAQ

Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CRANSTON, and Mr. SANFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 8

Resolved by the Senate,

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF INITIAL RESPONSE TO THE INVASION OF KUWAIT.

The Senate supports the actions taken by the President to defend Saudi Arabia, demands that Iraq immediately withdraw from its illegal occupation of Kuwait, and supports the President's diplomatic and economic initiatives to resolve the Persian Gulf crisis.

SEC. 2 REQUIREMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR OFFENSIVE MILITARY ACTION IN THE PERSIAN GULF.

The Senate finds that—

(1) the Constitution of the United States vests all power to declare war in the Congress of the United States; and

(2) any offensive military action taken by the United States against Iraq must be pursuant to an explicit authorization by the Congress before such action may be initiated.

SEC. 3 NOTIFICATION OF THE PRESIDENT.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President.

SENATE RESOLUTION 9—RELATIVE TO U.S. MILITARY FORCES IN THE PERSIAN GULF

Mr. MCCAIN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 9

Whereas, on August 2, 1990, military forces of the Republic of Iraq, under the direction of Iraqi president Saddam Hussein, invaded the small nation of Kuwait.

Whereas, in an effort to promote peace and regional stability in the Persian Gulf region, President Bush has deployed troops of the United States Armed Forces to the Persian Gulf region, in Operation Desert Shield, and has undertaken diplomatic initiatives;

Whereas, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 678, authorizing the use of military force if Iraqi forces do not withdraw from Kuwait by January 15, 1991;

Whereas, if the objective of Resolution 678 is to be achieved without war, Saddam Hussein must realize that the United States is steadfast in its determination to use the military force authorized by the resolution, if such action becomes necessary;

Whereas, Saddam Hussein has been led to believe that there exists opposition in the United States to the use of military force against Iraq and may believe that the steadfast determination of the United States will erode with the passage of time; and

Whereas, Saddam Hussein's unprovoked aggression against Kuwait must be answered in a swift and appropriate manner: Now, therefore, be it resolved that

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its support for bipartisan efforts to bring a just and meaningful peace to the Persian Gulf region;

(2) expresses its support for the diplomatic initiatives undertaken by President Bush, the deployment of troops of the United States Armed Forces to the Persian Gulf region, and the adoption of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 678;

(3) expresses its support for the goals and objectives of Operation Desert Shield; and

(4) urges the United States Armed Forces to continue to develop a strategy, plans, and contingency capability to achieve a quick, decisive victory in the event the use of military force against Iraq becomes necessary.

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution regarding the Persian Gulf and Operation Desert Shield in response to the concerns shared by many Americans that Congress exercise the utmost care to send a signal to Saddam Hussein that the United States resolve to enforce the

resolutions of the United Nations Security Council remains firm.

I share what I know to be the concern of all Americans over the risk of war and the loss of American lives incurred in our determination to confront Saddam Hussein's naked aggression in the gulf. I have experienced war. I have witnessed the loss of life, and understand the potential futility of committing precious resources to destruction. Mr. President, we must give peace every chance. We must give international negotiating efforts every chance. And we must all hope that world political and economic pressure will be enough to force Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait.

But, Mr. President, we must be unmistakably clear that the United States is steadfast in our determination to reverse Saddam Hussein's brutal imperialism. We must not give the impression that we are questioning our fundamental purpose for opposing Saddam or for deploying military forces as part of Operation Desert Shield.

I believe President Bush and his administration have performed brilliantly in constructing an unprecedented diplomatic, economic and military response to Iraqi aggression. The President deserves the widespread support and appreciation that he has received for the clarity, prudence, and efficacy of his policies. He has acted forcefully, but wisely.

The United States deserves the admiration of the world for having the courage of our convictions that international law regarding the sovereignty of nations must be respected. And we have earned the world's appreciation for our devotion to the creation of another, better world based on respect for international law and the lawful resolution of disputes between nations.

The United States is in the gulf because world order cannot be based on hope and good intentions alone. We have seen conflicts in the developing world cost the lives of millions, and produce over 10 million casualties and refugees since the end of World War II.

This is the moment, and the gulf is the place where we may well determine for a generation or more the nature of the post-cold-war world. If we do not stop Saddam now, the new world order will be defined by the proliferation of regional conflicts, the establishment of regional superpowers, and the transformation of the international arms race into a worldwide race for weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. President, we are in the gulf to defend the United States vital strategic interests, not to lower the price of gasoline. If Iraq's aggression stands, Saddam will control some 20 percent of all the world's proven oil reserves—roughly six times all the proven oil reserves in the United States.

More than 60 percent of all the world's proven oil reserves could come

under the de facto control of a ruthless dictator. We cannot predict precise consequences of such domination, but they could mean trillions of dollars in added world oil costs over the coming decades. That development could pose a lasting and devastating threat to our evermore interdependent global economy by making the development of Third World nations a near impossibility.

President Bush, to his credit, has organized more international support for peaceful alternatives to war than any other leader in contemporary history. In a period of months, he has led us out of the cold war and to the revitalization of the United Nations as an effective force for defending international law. He deserves the support of Congress for his efforts.

I have submitted this resolution to provide the Senate the opportunity to show our support for the President, for international law and for the creation of a better world order. It does not call for the use of force nor preclude the pursuit of other means for obtaining our objectives in the gulf.

This resolution recognizes the manifest culpability of Saddam Hussein for the crisis in the gulf, the threat that his aggression poses for the United States and the world, and the necessity of clear, concerted international opposition to his aggression. It supports a just and meaningful peace in the gulf, the diplomatic initiatives the President has undertaken, and the goals of Operation Desert Shield. It further urges the U.S. Armed Forces to continue to develop plans to achieve a quick and decisive victory in the gulf should force be judged necessary to achieve our purposes.

The purpose of this resolution is to let Saddam Hussein know that the United States is united in its determination not to allow his aggression to stand, and in its dedication to creating, another better world of free nations, at peace with one another and devoted to the rule of law. I strongly urge the Senate to adopt it.●

SENATE RESOLUTION 10—RELATIVE TO BURDENSHARING BY SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. D'AMATO submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

S. RES. 10

Whereas, the brutal Iraqi aggression against Kuwait has led to a massive, costly deployment of United States forces in the Persian Gulf to defend Saudi Arabia in Operation Desert Shield;

Whereas, the more than 400,000 brave American soldiers who are engaged in Operation Desert Shield are making daily sacrifices and may be called upon to make the ultimate sacrifice for their country;

Whereas, the over 120,000 Reservists who have been called to active duty by the Presi-

dent as part of Operation Desert Shield are also making enormous financial sacrifices, and their families are suffering the emotional and financial effects of their separation;

Whereas, the cost of Operation Desert Shield is continuing to escalate as the U.S. military commitment and needs mount;

Whereas, the sharp increase in the price of crude oil since Iraq's August 2 invasion of Kuwait has severely impacted the United States economy, affecting every American;

Whereas, the increase in oil production and the price of crude oil has led to enormous additional oil revenues flowing to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: Now, therefore, be it—

Resolved by the Senate, That the President should request the kingdom of Saudi Arabia to pay—

(1) the full cost of Operation Desert Shield;

(2) an amount sufficient to establish a fund administered by the United States Government from which each member of our Reserve components will receive the difference between their civilian pay before they were called to active duty and their military pay while they are on active duty for Operation Desert Shield;

(3) An amount sufficient to reimburse the United States for the \$7 billion cost of loans to Egypt the United States has forgiven due to Egypt's participation in Operation Desert Shield; and

(4) An amount to be agreed upon to offset the adverse impact on the U.S. economy resulting from the higher oil prices caused by the Persian Gulf crisis.

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today along with Senator PRESSLER to submit a resolution calling upon Saudi Arabia to: First, pay the full cost of Operation Desert Shield; second, reimburse U.S. Reservists for the difference between their civilian and military salaries; third, assume Egypt's \$7 billion debt to the United States; and fourth, reimburse the United States for costs incurred by higher oil prices.

Saudi Arabia should bear the lion's share of the costs of Operation Desert Shield, because it stands to gain the greatest direct benefit from our defense of the Persian Gulf and because it has the financial ability to do so. While American men and women are standing guard in the deserts of Saudi Arabia, the Saudis are fattening their own pocketbooks by reaping tens of billions in windfall oil profits. If not for America's stand, Saudi Arabia would have become the 20th Iraqi province.

Saudi Arabia has received a windfall increase in oil revenues and has substantially increased its oil production since the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Saudi oil revenue has increased from an estimated \$116 million per day in August 1990, based upon production of 5.8 million barrels a day, to as much as \$174 million per day, solely because the average world price of oil increased from \$20 per barrel to \$30 per barrel. This produces \$58 million in additional revenue every day.

In addition, Saudi production will increase by an estimated 2.83 million barrels per day, effective in January 1991. This increased production, sold at \$30

per barrel, is worth an additional \$84.9 million per day.

Thus, Saudi oil revenues in 1991 will total \$143 million more a day, or \$52 billion more for the entire year, than they were before the Persian Gulf crisis.

Nearly a half million young Americans in uniform now guard Saudi Arabia from Iraqi attack. The Defense Department has estimated that the total annual cost of Operation Desert Shield has gone up from \$15 billion to \$30 billion, based only upon already announced additional troop deployments. The Defense Department has placed no ceiling on this deployment, so it is reasonable to expect the number of troops to grow and the cost of the operation to increase again.

In the face of this fact, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, according to the U.S. Defense Department, has paid only \$760 million in cash and contributed only \$227 million in material support to Operation Desert Shield through November 29, 1990. This total contribution of \$987 million represents less than 7 days of the Saudi Oil revenue windfall.

It is time to renegotiate Saudi support for Operation Desert Shield. The original plan did not contemplate the size of the current effort, the number of Reserve personnel separated from their families, or the impact of the increases oil prices on the U.S. economy as a whole.

This resolution seeks to restore fairness and balance to our efforts against Iraqi aggression. We are in the Persian Gulf for the right reasons. It is now time for Saudi Arabia to do what's right.●

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to advise the Senate that the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies will tentatively hold its fiscal year 1992 public witness hearings on the following dates: April 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, and 25. The first day of hearings will include any testimony from Members of Congress.

The deadline for interested groups or individuals to submit their request to testify is Wednesday, March 6. All requests must be in writing and should be addressed to me in care of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, Senate Dirksen 186, Washington, DC 20510-6025.

Unfortunately, the subcommittee can be no longer accept reservations for multiple slots made by Washington representatives but instead must have signed requests from the individual organizations.

It should be noted that again this year, because of time constraints, the number of public witnesses will be limited to 150. Therefore, I urge interested parties to respond in a timely manner.

Those first 150 persons whose requests are received by March 6 will receive a letter providing instructions for their appearance before the subcommittee. Interested groups or individuals who are not among the first requests will be given the opportunity to have their written testimony published in the committee's hearing record.

The deadline for those who wish to submit statements for the hearing record will be Monday, May 6. Such statements must be no longer than 5 double-spaced pages, and three copies should be sent to me in care of the subcommittee.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the full committee of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will hold a hearing on legislation to provide for a referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, January 30, at 9:30 a.m. in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

For further information, please contact Allen Stayman at 202/224-7865.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Small Business Committee will hold two field hearings in Hartford, CT, on January 17 and 18, 1991. The hearings will examine the economy in New England and its effect on the region's small businesses. Both hearings will be held in room 2C of the Legislative Office Building in Hartford. The hearing on January 17, 1991, will commence at 10:30 a.m. and the hearing on January 18, 1991, will begin at 9:30 a.m. For further information, please call Ken Glueck of Senator LIEBERMAN's office at 224-4041, or Laura Lecky of the committee staff at 224-3099.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM J. DOYLE,
OUTSTANDING NEW JERSEYAN

• Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize an outstanding constituent of mine, Mr. William J. Doyle, of Millington, NJ. Bill Doyle has served as the executive vice president of the Independent Insurance Agents of New Jersey since 1964. After a distinguished career, Bill will retire on February 1, 1991. Bill has been a business leader in the State of New Jersey and a community leader in Millington.

Though Bill Doyle's dedication to his work is extraordinary, his constant concern for the well-being of his community deserves wide recognition. Bill

has been commander of the American Legion Post No. 228 in Springfield, NJ, and a member of Saint Vincent's Catholic Church Knights of Columbus. Bill also has been heavily involved with raising funds for the Multiple Sclerosis Foundation.

Bill started his career with the Independent Insurance Agents of New Jersey in 1957. In 1964 he was named executive vice president. In 1985, Bill was awarded a Presidential citation from the Independent Insurance Agents of America in recognition of his efforts as chairman of the membership committee which was responsible for adding nearly 1,000 new members from across the country.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing my constituent, William J. Doyle. His activism and leadership have been of great value to both his community and his profession. •

A SALUTE TO THE UNIVERSITY OF
COLORADO GOLDEN BUFFALOES

• Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of the 1991 college football national champion: the University of Colorado Golden Buffaloes.

The Buffs' victory over the Fighting Irish of Notre Dame in Tuesday's Orange Bowl is the capstone to a season in which CU claimed its first national championship in football. Who will ever forget the heroic efforts of Charles Johnson and his teammates, who valiantly met the challenge of coming from behind to win without their injured field general and starting quarterback, Darien Hagen? Without question, Colorado and Notre Dame provided the most exciting college football game in recent memory and certainly the most exciting game of the day.

The thrilling Orange Bowl triumph, coupled with a season in which the Buffs recorded an 11-1-1 mark against the most difficult schedule in the Nation, indicates that they are clearly the best college football team in the land. I speak for all Coloradans in saluting Coach McCartney and his team for their tremendous efforts and success.

I would like to take this opportunity to point out that we have also celebrated many outstanding academic accomplishments at the University of Colorado. For instance, Dr. Thomas Cech won the 1989 Nobel Prize in Chemistry for his groundbreaking work on the catalytic functions of ribonucleic acid. Further, in 1990 David Wilson—who studied mathematics at CU—joined Supreme Court Justice Byron "Whizzer" White, All-American football player Joe Romig, and Robert Morstein-Marx, as a Rhodes Scholar from the University of Colorado. CU also has one of the finest astrophysics and aeronautics programs in the Nation. In fact, 14 of the more than 100

NASA astronauts are Colorado alumni—a truly extraordinary percentage.

I am proud of the University of Colorado and its commitment to excellence. Darien Hagen, Eric Bieniemy, Joe Garten, Alfred Williams, Charles Johnson and the rest of the Buffs' squad furthered a tradition of outstanding achievement that begins in the classroom and extends to the gridiron.

Congratulations Colorado Buffaloes. •

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.
DAY

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, we will soon celebrate the sixth national holiday in honor of the late Dr. Martin Luther King. This national holiday stirs a great deal of passion in our Nation's soul. We feel so strongly because, despite great progress in the quest for equality, we have not yet reached the goals for which Dr. King strived. And we feel strongly because on January 15, 1991, Dr. King would have celebrated his 62d birthday had his life not so brutally been taken from him.

In celebrating Dr. King's birthday, we also celebrate an America that seeks to live up to the high ideals it set for itself—an America in which there would be justice for all. We honor a man who made our own Nation a better place, but also a man committed to fighting for justice all over the world. Dr. King's life work was a constant quest to eliminate the bonds of injustice in the land of the free. He fought the injustice of racial discrimination. He fought the injustice of economic exploitation. And he fought the injustice of intolerance.

Today, as we continue to seek to eliminate injustice, we should recall the eloquent words of Dr. King: "Human progress is neither automatic nor inevitable. Even a superficial look at history reveals that no social advance rolls in on the wheels of inevitability. Every step toward the goal of justice requires sacrifice, suffering, and struggle."

Dr. King led and inspired Americans of all color, religion, and economic backgrounds to make the sacrifices that made the United States more free and more just. Ending legal segregation, obtaining voting rights for all citizens, and fighting for fairness in the workplace came at great expense to Dr. King and thousands of other courageous citizens who faced beatings, bombings, jail, and, for many, death. Yet as Dr. King preached the difficult words of struggle, he also remained optimistic about the ultimate success of what he called the freedom movement: "We shall overcome."

We do well to follow Dr. King's inspiration by enacting laws that enable individuals to enjoy their constitutional rights. We must also move forward to root out forces that prevent individuals

from enjoying the full measure of their freedom. As we begin 1991, one-half of all black American children live below the poverty line. These young people face tremendous barriers to success. Our Government has an obligation to assure Americans of all races and backgrounds a quality education, decent health care, safe housing, and equal opportunity so that each person can live their lives fully and freely.

But we must recognize that Government cannot solve every problem. We must all work together. We must recognize that if any of our fellow Americans is denied the opportunity to make use of his or her talents we are all worse off. Americans must summon the spirit of brotherhood that Dr. King so firmly believed in. That is why the national celebration in honor of Dr. King and his work is so vitally important. If we are to move forward, we must heed the lessons he taught us and continue the fight for equal justice and opportunity.●

SILVER KNIGHTS MILITARY TWIRLING CORPS

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the outstanding achievements of the Silver Knights Military Twirling Corps for being selected as the 1990 Illinois, Midwest, and USA National Military Twirling Corps champions.

The members of the team Chris Cusack, Jennifer Davidson, Michelle Israel, Erika Jackson, Meredith Kaiser, Kate Karwowski, Ginger Latelle, Dianna Lunekas, Naomi Mays, Kathy Milewski, Bonnie Rasmussen, Tricia Thomson, Natalie Aliota, Kim Grabowski, Melissa Kaiser, Jill Kron, Michelle Lunekas, Kathleen Peaslee, Michelle Alberts, Laura Jackson, and Melissa Nemecek are from all parts of Illinois and deserve the highest praise for their hard work and accomplishments.

These young ladies display overwhelming qualities of leadership and spirit. Illinoisans can be proud of these young persons and the outstanding performances they have rendered while representing the State of Illinois in their many competitions.

I would like to join my voice with my fellow Illinoisans in praising the Silver Knights for a job well done. Their talent and spirit of accomplishment are an inspiration to young persons everywhere. I applaud the Silver Knights and look forward to many future accomplishments by these talented young individuals.●

FUNDING FOR THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I rise to draw the attention of my colleagues to a matter of the gravest concern for this

Nation's 40 million Social Security recipients.

Because of the possibility of a very narrow reading of the new Budget Enforcement Act, the vital services provided by the Social Security Administration—services that have been stretched and strained in recent years—could be curtailed dramatically.

While the issue here is technical, the principles and concepts are quite basic. The new Budget Act clearly takes the Social Security fund and all Social Security outlays out of the budget in order to protect the integrity of that self-financing system.

Yet, under another section of the act, the costs of servicing the Social Security Program—the costs of processing claims, answering questions, and hearing appeals—could be construed as being one of the accounts under the new domestic discretionary spending cap. Since this program would be competing with all other domestic spending, this could mean inadequate resources for the Social Security Administration in the coming fiscal year and beyond—a result that was clearly not contemplated by the Members of this body when we wisely chose to remove the Social Security surplus from the budget.

Now, whenever you have a document as comprehensive and far reaching as this new budget agreement, there are bound to be some gray areas of interpretation. This, however, should not be one of them. The Social Security fund is in surplus, and we have an absolute obligation not only to protect the fund itself, but to provide the services necessary for the proper administration of the fund. We have an absolute obligation to ensure that our elderly and disabled citizens receive efficient, timely, and reliable assistance with their benefits claims.

All of which is in jeopardy if funding for the Social Security Administration is subject to these spending caps.

Technical arguments aside, if these caps are permitted to govern, the result can be summed up in one word—hardship. Hardship for recipients, and hardship on an administrative system that's already overloaded.

I want to make clear, Mr. President, that this is not a partisan matter. The President's Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Louis Sullivan, has himself sounded a very loud alarm. He has indicated plainly that the cuts in his budget request—cuts demands by OMB—would lead to an erosion of services for aged and disabled beneficiaries.

Now, as all of us in this Congress are aware, that erosion began some time ago.

Over the past 6 years, under Presidents Reagan and Bush, the Social Security Administration has had the number of its employees reduced by 17,000. As a result, local field offices are grossly understaffed, and our constitu-

ents are unable to get through on the phone. I understand that beneficiaries now call one nationwide 800 telephone number—a number that is plagued by busy signals, especially during peak periods of the month, because there is insufficient staff to answer these calls.

All of this is unacceptable. But with the additional resource constraints that will follow if services funding is insufficient, the situation may become intolerable. Dr. Sullivan has advised that disability claim backlogs—an area of service already under great stress—will increase from 3 to 6 months.

In my home State of Tennessee, nearly 96,000 citizens apply for Social Security benefits each year. Overall, we have 715,000 retirees and 112,000 disability recipients—each of whom receives on average \$550 a month. And for most of these people, that modest monthly check is their lifeblood—it goes for housing and food and medicine. They deserve a level of service with regard to these benefits that is unquestionably sound and free of worry and doubt.

I have written a letter to OMB Director Darman detailing my concern to him. OMB will make a ruling on this in the near future, and I would strongly urge that office to take Social Security Administration funding out from under the domestic discretionary cap, and to allow this Government to provide the services necessary for the proper administration of Social Security benefits.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this month marks the 73d anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence. While the Ukrainian people have had a unique and rich culture and heritage for a millennium, they have ruled themselves as a politically independent and sovereign nation only intermittently.

In this century, Ukrainians fought for independence at the time of the First and Second World Wars but the Soviet empire prevailed. Once again the Ukrainian people had to struggle to preserve and maintain their unique identity while being dominated by an outside power.

As the world knows, they have succeeded in that effort. Free people everywhere recognize and honor the men and women who have prevailed in their tenacious battle to maintain Ukrainian culture, religion, traditions, and language.

Mr. President, the current situation is fraught with danger, opportunity, and hope. As the Soviet Union's empire is battered by events and the yearnings of its various peoples, the opportunity for Ukrainian freedom and independence is before us. When that day arrives it is important that we remember and pay tribute to those countless Ukrainians that struggled and suffered

and sacrificed through the years to keep the dream alive, and made the eventual victory possible.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM D. SWEASY

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize William D. Sweasy, an outstanding citizen who lives along the shores of the Mississippi River in beautiful Red Wing, MN. Among the most valuable honors a person can achieve are the appreciation and gratitude of neighbors and friends. This gentleman is a person who has endlessly contributed his life and talents to his community and is a fine example of a compassionate and industrious American.

William Sweasy's lifelong commitment to his community has made him a gem in the eyes of his neighbors. He is the recipient of the annual Red Wing Neighbor Award, a prestigious honor he very much deserves. Many of you may know of Mr. Sweasy through his association with the Red Wing Shoe Co. Even President George Bush enjoys the quality of the boots that the company manufactures.

Mr. Sweasy began working in the finishing and shipping department of the Red Wing Shoe Co. at age 16, and he eventually became the chairman of the board. The company's success stems from the personal touch it provides to customers, employees, and retailers. This initiative has been the strength of the company, and it is William's guide.

It is obvious that William loves the vibrant beauty and rich history of the area in which he lives. Over the years he has enhanced the community by providing years of service to preserve the fine quality of life in Red Wing. William is a member of the First Presbyterian Church, he helped to create the Environmental Learning Center through the YMCA, he undertook the renovation and restoration of the historic, architecturally detailed St. James Hotel, he was on the Red Wing Public School Board for 12 years, and he has organized the Red Wing Fund of the St. Paul Foundation for community projects. These are only a few of his community activities, and his leadership is felt at the State and national levels as well. He has served on the Minnesota Citizens Council on Crime and Justice, and the Minnesota Council on Foundations. He also has been on the board of directors, serving, too, as the chairman of the American Footwear Industries of America.

Of his willingness to participate in community affairs, William said:

When you live in a town and grow up in it, you realize the environment of the city is part of the benefits of working here. The community has enjoyed a lot of public-spirited people. (Red Wing Republican Eagle, 1983)

Well, thank you, Mr. Sweasy, for being part of the spirit of your commu-

nity and country. We all benefit from the example of your life and wish you the best in the years to come.●

PROBLEMS OF PRIVATE DEPOSIT INSURANCE

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, the collapse of the Rhode Island Share and Deposit Indemnity Corp. should remind us of the frailty of existing private deposit insurance systems—a frailty repeatedly demonstrated during the 1980's.

Some observers may conclude that Federal deposit insurance should be required for all State-chartered institutions that accept deposits from the general public—as it is already required for all national banks, federally chartered thrift institutions, and Federal credit unions. Unless and until such a step is taken, we should act to be certain that depositors of privately insured institutions clearly understand that their money is not federally insured. Depositors can then make an informed individual decision about whether to forego the benefits of Federal insurance.

At my insistence, the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 required every thrift that is not federally insured to disclose clearly and conspicuously in periodic statements of account and in all advertising that the savings association's deposits are not federally insured. This requirement helps ensure that current and prospective customers of such institutions understand that their money is at risk—and not protected by Federal deposit insurance.

The Comprehensive Deposit Insurance Reform and Taxpayer Protection Act of 1990—which I introduced on September 25, 1990, as S. 3103—reinforces these protections and extends them to uninsured banks. Section 14(e) of the bill requires clear and conspicuous disclosure not only in all advertising and periodic statements of account but on all signature cards, passbooks, and certificates of deposit.

When I reintroduce S. 3103 this year, I intend to propose that these protections apply to all depository institutions—licensed or unlicensed—including credit unions. By unlicensed depository institutions, I mean entities such as the recently failed Latin Investment Corp. of Washington, DC, which was not chartered or otherwise authorized to accept deposits. I will also look closely into whether current law contains adequate protections against private insurers adopting names that could mislead depositors into believing that their money is federally insured.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, pursuant to the earlier agreement, time was set aside today for the introduc-

tion of Senate resolutions relating to the Persian Gulf and for debate on that or any other matter during today. We have had several hours of debate, over 5 hours, I believe, with several speakers on the Persian Gulf and other subjects.

I am advised by staff of both the majority and the minority that there are no other Senators who wish to speak. I earlier today said and emphasized that any Senator could speak for as long as he or she wants, today, obviously. And we would remain in session until all Senators had that opportunity. That now having been the case, and no other Senators wishing to address the Senate, I will momentarily seek consent to stand in recess until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, January 8.

To recapitulate, just briefly, for the information of Senators who may not have heard my earlier remarks, the session on Tuesday will be pro forma. We will then go to a session on Thursday, January 10, at 10 a.m., and from that session, we will go to a regular session of the Senate on Monday, January 14.

However, under the agreement, I have received the authority to proceed from pro forma session to regular session on next week and have indicated that it is my intention to do so on Thursday for the purpose of the swearing in of the newly appointed Senator from California, Senator JOHN SEYMOUR.

I have also indicated and reiterate now that I am also considering the possibility of having a regular session to deal with debate on the Persian Gulf crisis beginning on Thursday. I have not made any decision. I intend to consult closely with the distinguished Republican leader, with the Speaker of the House, and with many other Senators over the next several days. But Senators should be aware that we will be getting to debate on the Persian Gulf situation it now appears sometime between next Thursday at 10 a.m. and the following Monday at 10 a.m. I expect to announce a decision on that probably next Wednesday after the meeting between Secretary Baker and the Iraqi Foreign Minister has been completed.

So, for planning schedules as of now, it appears the session on Tuesday will be strictly pro forma with no likelihood of that being changed. However, with respect to Thursday, there is, indeed, the possibility that we will begin the debate on the Persian Gulf situation and dealing with resolutions as of that date. That decision will be made and announced prior to 10 a.m. on Thursday.

RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 1991, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, and if no other

Senator is seeking recognition, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, January 8.

There being no objection, at 6:21 p.m., the Senate recessed until Tuesday, January 8, 1991, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 4, 1991:

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WENDELL P. GARDNER, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF 15 YEARS, VICE ANNICE MCBRYDE WAGNER.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

ARTHUR J. HILL, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE C. AUSTIN FITTS, RESIGNED.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

JAMES F. HOOBLER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE CHARLES R. GILLIAM, RESIGNED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DONALD A. HENDERSON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY, VICE JAMES B. WYNGAARDEN, RESIGNED.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

EDWARD JOHNSON, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 22, 1995, VICE WILLIAM F. PICKARD, TERM EXPIRED.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

EDSON G. CASE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 18, 1995.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SUSANNAH SIMPSON KENT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM SERVICES, VICE DAPHNE WOOD MURRAY, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

EUNICE N. SATO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 1991, VICE NOREEN C. THOMAS, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CHARLES M. HOUSE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME, (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

JOHN MICHAEL MERCANTI, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE ENGRAVER IN THE MINT OF THE UNITED STATES AT PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA, VICE ELIZABETH JONES, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

CHARLES L. CRAGIN, OF MAINE, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS FOR A TERM OF 6 YEARS, (NEW POSITION—P.L. 100-687)

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

CECIL B. THOMPSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 1991, VICE SIMON C. FIREMAN, RESIGNED.

CECIL B. THOMPSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 1996, (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

FORD BARNEY FORD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF 6 YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 1996, (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

WALTER E. MASSEY, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR A TERM OF 6 YEARS, VICE ERICH BLOCH, TERM EXPIRED.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

ROBERT WILLIAM GAMBINO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE, VICE SAMUEL K. LESSEY, JR., RESIGNED.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

WILLIAM H. KENNOY, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR THE TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 1996, VICE CHARLES H. DEAN, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

JOHN ASHCROFT, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 1993, VICE TERRY EDWARDS BRANSTAD, TERM EXPIRED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

WILLIAM A. GEOGHEGAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY BOARD FOR CUBA BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 27, 1992, VICE MIDGE DECTER, TERM EXPIRED.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

JOHN ELLIOTT REYNOLDS, III, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING MAY 13, 1993, VICE ROBERT ELSNER, TERM EXPIRED.

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

KARL C. ROVE, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 28, 1991, VICE EDWARD NOONAN NEY, TERM EXPIRED.

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

JAMES R. WHELAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 20, 1994, VICE HAROLD K. PHILLIPS, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED PERSONS TO BE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT FOR THE TERMS INDICATED:

EUGENE L. MADEIRA, OF PENNSYLVANIA, FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 1991, VICE DONALD M. CLARK.

DALE P. GOLD, OF VIRGINIA, FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 1992, VICE RUTH REEVE JENSON, TERM EXPIRED.

A. PIERRE GUILLERMIN, OF VIRGINIA, FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 1993, VICE ROBERT LEE MCELATH, TERM EXPIRED.

JACK RAYMOND REED, OF MISSISSIPPI, FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 1993, VICE FRANCES MATHEWS, TERM EXPIRED.

JUNE SCOBEE RODGERS, OF ARIZONA, FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 1993, VICE CAROL PENDAS WHITTEN, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED PERSONS TO BE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY FOR THE TERMS INDICATED:

JOHN LEOPOLD, OF MARYLAND, FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 1991, VICE BRENDA PREMO, TERM EXPIRED.

MARY ANN MOBLEY-COLLINS, OF CALIFORNIA, FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 1991, VICE JONI TADA, TERM EXPIRED.

GEORGE H. OBERLE, JR., OF OKLAHOMA, FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 1992, (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

CAPTAIN CHRISTIAN ANDREASEN FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF), WHILE SERVING IN A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY AS DEPUTY DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF NOAA CORPS OPERATIONS, NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, AND CAPTAIN FREDDIE L. JEFFRIES FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF), WHILE SERVING IN A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY AS DIRECTOR, ATLANTIC MARINE CENTER, NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 33, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 853U.

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

HENRY H. BASSFORD, OF CONNECTICUT.
LAURANCE W. BOND, OF CALIFORNIA.
JULIUS E. COLES, OF VIRGINIA.
MARY C. KILGOUR, OF VIRGINIA.
JAMES A. NORRIS, OF VIRGINIA.

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

LARRY K. CRANDALL, OF VIRGINIA.
JAMES PATRICK DONNELLY, OF FLORIDA.
FRED C. FISCHER, OF VIRGINIA.
JOHN P. HUMMON, OF MARYLAND.
CARL H. LEONARD, OF VIRGINIA.
MARK S. MATTHEWS, OF FLORIDA.
CAROL A. PEASLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
KENNETH H. SHERPER, OF VIRGINIA.
THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, AND FOR APPOINTMENT, AS CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE, AS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

DIANNE METZGER BLANE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
GARY LEWIS BYLLESBY, OF CALIFORNIA.
SIDNEY ANDREW CHERNENKOFF, OF VIRGINIA.
DONALD BOLYSTON CLARK, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.
LOUIS J. COOKE, OF FLORIDA.
ROBERT T. DAKAN, OF CALIFORNIA.
BRYANT GEORGE, OF NEW JERSEY.
MICHAEL J. HACKER, OF FLORIDA.
KATHLEEN DOLLAR HANSEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

BRUCE R. HOWARD, OF CALIFORNIA.
GEORGE JONES, OF COLORADO.
FREDERICK A. KALHAMMER, OF CALIFORNIA.
DAVID LEIBSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
EMILY CLAIRE LEONARD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

JAMES B. LOWENTHAL, OF TENNESSEE.
PETER R. ORR, OF FLORIDA.
CYNTHIA F. ROZELL, OF CALIFORNIA.
MARK SILVERMAN, OF CALIFORNIA.
JOHN A. TENNANT, OF CALIFORNIA.
ERIC R. ZALLMAN, OF FLORIDA.

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, AND CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

BRUNO A. KOSHELEFF, OF CONNECTICUT.
LINDA N. LION, OF VIRGINIA.
PAUL B. THORN, OF NEW YORK.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY FOR PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

WILLIAM A. RUGH, OF MARYLAND.
CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

CRESCENCO S. ARCOS, JR., OF TEXAS.
JOHN PHILIP HARROD, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.
ROBERT R. LAGAMMA, OF VIRGINIA.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE AS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

WILLIAM J. A. BARNES, OF MASSACHUSETTS.
LOUISE KELLEHER CRANE, OF VIRGINIA.
JAMES MICHAEL HALEY, OF WASHINGTON.
THOMAS NEIL HULL, III, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.
VICTOR L. JACKOVICH, OF VIRGINIA.
ROBERT E. MCCARTHY, OF VIRGINIA.
LLOYD W. NEIGHBORS, JR., OF TEXAS.
JOHN TREACY, OF ILLINOIS.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

CHAS. W. FREEMAN, JR., OF RHODE ISLAND.
RAYMOND G. H. SEITZ, OF TEXAS.
ALEXANDER FLETCHER WATSON, OF MASSACHUSETTS.
MELISSA FOELSCH WELLS, OF CONNECTICUT.
CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

MARC ALLEN BAAS, OF FLORIDA.
G. PAUL BALABANIS, OF CALIFORNIA.
BRUCE ANTHONY BEARDSLEY, OF NEVADA.
ERIC J. BOSWELL, OF CALIFORNIA.
CHARLES H. BRAYSHAW, OF WYOMING.
LAURENCE G. BROWN, M.D., OF VIRGINIA.
RAYMOND F. BURGHARDT, JR., OF FLORIDA.
ROBERT L. CAFFREY, OF CALIFORNIA.
PETER R. CHAVEAS, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
MARTIN L. CHESHES, OF NEW YORK.
PRISCILLA ANN CLAPP, OF MASSACHUSETTS.
JAMES F. COLLINS, OF ILLINOIS.
RYAN CLARK CROCKER, OF WASHINGTON.
DIANE DILLARD, OF TEXAS.
BRUCE F. DUNCOMBE, OF MARYLAND.
JOHN D. FINNEY, JR., OF VIRGINIA.
THOMAS HOWARD CEWECKE, OF MASSACHUSETTS.
PAUL H. GRUNDY, OF WASHINGTON.
HUGH G. HAMILTON, JR., OF MISSOURI.
JOHN L. HIRSCH, OF NEW YORK.

ROBERT ONAN HOMME, OF MINNESOTA.
 RICHARD B. HOWARD, OF FLORIDA.
 GREGORY L. JOHNSON, OF WASHINGTON.
 JOHN J. LAMAZZA, OF NEW YORK.
 ALPHONSE F. LAPORTA, OF NEW YORK.
 JOSEPH EDWARD LAKE, OF TEXAS.
 WARREN E. LITTELL, JR., OF ILLINOIS.
 KEVIN J. MCGUIRE, OF MARYLAND.
 J. PHILLIP MCLEAN, OF WASHINGTON.
 RICHARD W. MUELLER, OF CONNECTICUT.
 MARK E. MULVEY, OF CONNECTICUT.
 JOSEPH P. O'NEILL, OF NEW YORK.
 CRISTOBAL ROBERTO OROZCO, OF CALIFORNIA.
 B. LYNN PASCOE, OF MISSOURI.
 ROBERT MAXWELL PRINGLE, OF VIRGINIA.
 ROBERT RACKMALES, OF MARYLAND.
 HAROLD E. RINIER, OF OREGON.
 DONALD R. SCHOBEL, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
 KATHERINE SHIRLEY, OF ILLINOIS.
 ELIZABETH A. SWIFT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
 LAWRENCE PALMER TAYLOR, OF OHIO.
 PHILIP BATES TAYLOR III, OF TEXAS.
 WILLIAM H. TWADDELL, OF RHODE ISLAND.
 GEORGE F. WARD, JR., OF NEW YORK.
 JAMES A. WEINER, OF CALIFORNIA.
 ANDREW JAN WINTER, OF NEW YORK.
 JOHN MELVIN YATES, OF WASHINGTON.
 JOHNNY YOUNG, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, AND FOR APPOINTMENT, AS CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE, AS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

MARSHALL P. ADAIR, OF FLORIDA.
 LESLIE M. ALEXANDER, OF NEW YORK.
 JEFFREY A. BADER, OF FLORIDA.
 RICHARD M. BASH, OF OKLAHOMA.
 ROBERT M. BEECROFT, OF MARYLAND.
 LAWRENCE NEAL BENEDICT, OF CALIFORNIA.
 JAMES D. BINDENAGEL, OF CALIFORNIA.
 JOHN WILLIAM BLANEY, OF CALIFORNIA.
 ANITA SHASHY BOOTH, OF FLORIDA.
 RICHARD THOMAS BOOTH, OF FLORIDA.
 RICHARD A. BOUCHER, OF NEW YORK.
 RALPH L. BOYCE, JR., OF VIRGINIA.
 KENNETH C. BRILL, OF CALIFORNIA.
 LARRY G. BUTCHER, OF VIRGINIA.
 JOHN CAMPBELL, OF VIRGINIA.
 JAMES B. CUNNINGHAM, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
 GEORGIA J. DEBELL, OF CALIFORNIA.
 ROYCE J. FICHTE, OF VIRGINIA.
 THOMAS P. HAMILTON, OF CALIFORNIA.
 BARBARA S. HARVEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
 PATRICK R. HAYES, OF MARYLAND.
 DONALD S. HAYS, OF VIRGINIA.
 DONALD K. HOLM, OF FLORIDA.
 JOHN C. HOLZMAN, OF HAWAII.
 JOHN F. HOOG, OF MISSOURI.
 J. AUBREY HOOKS, OF VIRGINIA.
 DANIEL A. JOHNSON, OF FLORIDA.
 JUDITH RODES JOHNSON, OF TEXAS.
 ROBERT D. JOHNSON, OF MISSOURI.
 ARMA JANE KARAER, OF VIRGINIA.
 JOHN F. KEANE, OF NEW YORK.
 MARY VIRGINIA KENNEDY, OF IDAHO.
 DONALD WILLIS KEYSER, OF VIRGINIA.
 RUSSELL F. KING, OF CALIFORNIA.
 ERIC A. KUNSMAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
 DANIEL CHARLES KURTZER, OF FLORIDA.
 HOWARD H. LANGE, OF WASHINGTON.
 RICHARD P. LIVINGSTON, OF TENNESSEE.
 GREGORY LYNN MATSON, OF NEW JERSEY.
 MARY MARGARET MCAITEER, OF FLORIDA.
 ROGER A. MCGUIRE, OF OHIO.
 WILLIAM DALE MONTGOMERY, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
 COLEMAN J. NEE, OF MASSACHUSETTS.
 RONALD E. NEUMANN, OF CALIFORNIA.
 PATRICK J. NICHOLS, OF VIRGINIA.
 DAVID A. PABST, OF WASHINGTON.
 RUDOLF VILEM PERINA, OF CALIFORNIA.
 ROBIN LYNN RAPHEL, OF WASHINGTON.
 ROBERT C. REIS, JR., OF MISSOURI.
 JONATHAN B. RICKERT, OF CONNECTICUT.
 KATHRYN DEE ROBINSON, OF TENNESSEE.
 THOMAS LEE ROBINSON, OF MICHIGAN.
 LOUIS D. SELL, OF KENTUCKY.
 JOSEPH C. SNYDER III, OF CONNECTICUT.
 ROBERT E. TYNES, OF VIRGINIA.
 JOHN W. VESSEY, III, OF VIRGINIA.
 DEAN L. WELTY, OF INDIANA.
 JAMES C. WHITLOCK, JR., OF CONNECTICUT.
 JOHN F. TEFPT, OF VIRGINIA.
 BARBARA J. TOBIAS, OF CALIFORNIA.
 JOSEPH CHARLES WILSON IV, OF CALIFORNIA.
 VIRGINIA CARSON YOUNG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, AND CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JAMES W. BAYUK, OF ILLINOIS.
 ELDON E. BELL, OF SOUTH DAKOTA.
 JEROME J. BOSKEN, OF OHIO.
 RICHARD A. BRUNO, OF VIRGINIA.
 WILLIAM W. GALLAGHER, OF MARYLAND.
 STEVEN D. JOHNSON, M.D., OF GEORGIA.
 WALTER H. SARGENT, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.
 JOHN JAMES SMITH III, OF CALIFORNIA.
 PETER F. SPALDING, OF CALIFORNIA.

ANTHONY J. WALTERS, OF CALIFORNIA.
 THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE AGENCIES INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED, AND ALSO FOR THE OTHER APPOINTMENTS INDICATED HEREWITH:
 FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

WILLIAM CHARLES MONTONEY, OF OHIO.
 MARCUS L. STEVENSON, OF VIRGINIA.
 FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RAYMOND R. BACA, OF MARYLAND.
 RAPHAEL A. MIRABAL, OF VIRGINIA.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MICHAEL SPECK, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

LILLIANA AYALDE, OF MARYLAND.
 REGINALD BRYAN CHASTAIN, OF FLORIDA.
 RALPH THOMAS DALY, OF VIRGINIA.
 MICHAEL J. ENDERS, OF VIRGINIA.
 ULRICH F. W. ERNST, OF MASSACHUSETTS.
 PETER BURKE KRESGE, OF WASHINGTON.
 THOMAS F. MILLER, OF CALIFORNIA.
 FREDERICK G. RYLEY, OF CONNECTICUT.
 DAVID A. WASHBURN, OF WYOMING.

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INGRID MALL KILLIST, OF NEW JERSEY.
 ROBERTO POWERS, OF OHIO.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ROBERT P. BEYER, OF OHIO.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MICKEY R. FRISBY, OF OKLAHOMA.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

DAVID ERNEST ECKERSON, OF WASHINGTON.
 DANA D. FISCHER, OF OREGON.
 LYNN A. KEEYS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
 ELISABETH ANNE KVITASHVILL, OF VIRGINIA.
 DIANNE C. TSITSOS, OF MASSACHUSETTS.
 ANTHONY J. VODRASKA, OF WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

CAROL WILDER, OF CALIFORNIA.

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PAMELA S. BELLAMY, OF CALIFORNIA.
 MICHAEL R. BOSSHART, OF NEW JERSEY.
 DAVID EDWARD BROWN, OF FLORIDA.
 LAURENT D. CHARBONNET, OF LOUISIANA.
 DANIEL PATRICK CLAFFEY, OF CALIFORNIA.
 JONATHAN RAPHAEL COHEN, OF CALIFORNIA.
 MARYRUTH COLEMAN, OF CONNECTICUT.
 JEANNETTE E. DAVIS, OF CALIFORNIA.
 DOROTHY ANNE DELAHANTY, OF MARYLAND.
 MARK DAVID DEMBRO, OF MASSACHUSETTS.
 DAVID ANTHONY DENNY, OF TEXAS.
 DHARAMCHAND DEPOO, OF NEW JERSEY.
 MICHAEL JAMES DODMAN, OF NEW YORK.
 ELIZABETH ANN EWING, OF CALIFORNIA.
 FRANCISCO JAVIER FERNANDEZ, OF NORTH CAROLINA.
 MARK ANDRE GOODFRIEND, OF CALIFORNIA.
 DONALD LEE HEFLIN, OF ALABAMA.
 MARK JAY HERZBERG, OF MARYLAND.
 MARY ELLEN HICKEY, OF CALIFORNIA.
 JAMES LAYTON HUSKEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

BARBARA L. JONES, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
 KIM WHITE KAMBOURIAN, OF KANSAS.
 DOUGLAS G. KELLY, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
 NAN TERESE KENNELLY, OF NEW JERSEY.
 THOMAS HAROLD LLOYD, OF WISCONSIN.
 NAOMI EMERSON LYEW, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
 LAUREN I. MAY, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
 WILLIAM ROBERT MEARA, OF NEW YORK.
 ROBERT W. MOORE, OF RHODE ISLAND.
 LINDA HOWARD MUNCY, OF NORTH CAROLINA.
 MICHAEL FREDERIC O'CONNOR, OF NEW YORK.
 ANDREW J. QUINN, OF NEW YORK.
 DAVID THOMAS ROCKEY, OF WASHINGTON.
 ALVIN DAVID RUTLEDGE, OF VIRGINIA.
 DEBORAH JANE SELIGSOHN, OF NEW YORK.
 DIANE W. SHELBY, OF OHIO.
 CAROL JEAN SMETANA, OF NEW MEXICO.
 CAROL L. STRICKER, OF VIRGINIA.
 DONALD GENE TETTELBAUM, OF VIRGINIA.
 JAMES LAFAYETTE TRAWEEK, OF TEXAS.
 WILLIAM A. WEECH, OF VIRGINIA.

JANICE GAIL WEINER, OF WASHINGTON.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

WILLIE O. GRAY, OF NORTH CAROLINA.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

JEFFREY MARTIN HILL, OF MARYLAND.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND/OR SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AS INDICATED:

CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:
 JOHN K. ALLEN, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
 KATRINA J. BARLOW, OF VIRGINIA.
 SHEILA A. BELEW, OF VIRGINIA.
 BEVERLY J. BERG, OF CALIFORNIA.
 GERALD G. BLYTHE, OF VIRGINIA.
 ANDREW NORBU BOWEN, OF TEXAS.
 ELIZABETH D. BRAZILL, OF MICHIGAN.
 DAVID S. BRIDGES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
 MARGARET SHARPS CATON, OF CONNECTICUT.
 SANDRA CHANEY, OF VIRGINIA.
 TODD CRAWFORD CHAPMAN, OF TEXAS.
 ANDREW D. CRAFT, OF IOWA.
 OLA CRISS, OF VIRGINIA.
 GREGGORY D. CROUCH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

JOHN WILLIAM CROWLEY, OF CALIFORNIA.
 THOMAS P. DARCY, OF VIRGINIA.
 ELIZABETH W. DAVIS, OF VIRGINIA.
 KATHRYN DOAN, OF VIRGINIA.
 STEPHEN ANDREW DODSON, OF TEXAS.
 BRIAN PETER DOHERTY, OF FLORIDA.
 THOMAS J. DOUGHERTY, OF VIRGINIA.
 JEFFREY M. EGAN, OF VIRGINIA.
 MICHELLE D. ENGLISH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

ROBERT A. ENRIQUEZ, OF VIRGINIA.
 LISA CATHERINE ERRION, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

HASKELL A. ERWIN, OF VIRGINIA.
 MARTHA ELIZABETH ESTELL, OF VIRGINIA.
 CHARLES S. FADDIS, OF VIRGINIA.
 KATHLEEN FARELL, OF VIRGINIA.
 ANNETTE P. FEELEY, OF NEW JERSEY.
 TARA FERET, OF CALIFORNIA.
 YNGVE CHARLES FLINTA, OF VIRGINIA.
 MEGAN MARIE GAAL, OF CALIFORNIA.
 MICHAEL G. GABLE, OF VIRGINIA.
 JAMES HUGH GEOGHEGAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS.
 GEOFFREY N. GILES, OF VIRGINIA.
 MARGARET F. GOURLAY, OF MARYLAND.
 ANNE E. GRIMES, OF VIRGINIA.
 JANE GRINWIS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
 MATTHEW SEAN GUNNING, OF VIRGINIA.
 GREGORY SCOTT HAIN, OF VIRGINIA.
 CAROL STEVENSON HARLOW, OF COLORADO.
 JULIA HASSENMILLER, OF VIRGINIA.
 TYRONE L. HAYDEN, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

PETER A. HAYES, OF WASHINGTON.
 LISA L. HELLING, OF VIRGINIA.
 JULIANNE JOHNSON, OF MISSISSIPPI.
 CHRIS H. JONES, OF VIRGINIA.
 APRIL SAMARA KANNE, OF VIRGINIA.
 JOHN J. KEARNS, OF VIRGINIA.
 GURUBHAI SINGH KHALSA, OF ARIZONA.
 JOHN J. KIEFER, OF VIRGINIA.
 ROBERT A. KING, OF VIRGINIA.
 MARC DANIEL KOEHLER, OF CALIFORNIA.
 SAMUEL C. LAEUCHLI, OF WEST VIRGINIA.
 PETER B. LAMONTAGNE, OF VIRGINIA.
 GREGORY B. LANE, OF CALIFORNIA.
 DALE LARGENT, OF WASHINGTON.
 DAVID LAWRENCE, OF NEW YORK.
 SAHOON LEE, OF VIRGINIA.
 SHARON D. LOCRAFT, OF VIRGINIA.
 MICHAEL T. MANESS, OF VIRGINIA.
 GERALD L. MASON, OF VIRGINIA.
 MATTHEW C. MASON, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
 ELLIOTT D. MCCARTY, OF CALIFORNIA.
 MARISA MCGETTIGAN, OF VIRGINIA.
 MARGARET B. MCKEAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
 TIMOTHY MICHAEL MCNAMARA, OF VIRGINIA.
 WILLIAM R. MOORE, OF VIRGINIA.
 MARY T. MUMLEY, OF VIRGINIA.
 LYNN ELIZABETH MUNN, OF CALIFORNIA.
 EDGAR MYERS, OF VIRGINIA.
 JONATHAN ERIC OWEN NUSSBAUM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

BARBARA A. PERREAULT, OF VIRGINIA.
 CAMERON DEAN PFORR, OF CONNECTICUT.
 J. ANDREW PLOWMAN, OF TEXAS.
 RICHARD D. POLKA, OF VIRGINIA.
 JEFFERY W. PORTER, OF VIRGINIA.
 TERENCE E. PRAY, OF VIRGINIA.
 JAMES ROBERT PUTT, OF VIRGINIA.
 JANA M. RAKUSAN, OF VIRGINIA.
 TOMAS RAKUSAN, OF VIRGINIA.
 JOSEPH THOMAS RATHFORD, JR., OF VIRGINIA.
 MICHAEL ALAN RATNEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

JOSEPH M. RIPLEY, OF VIRGINIA.
 MORRIS WILLIAM ROBERTS, OF OHIO.
 JOHN ROBERT RODGERS, OF VIRGINIA.
 SCOTT LAIRD ROLSTON, OF FLORIDA.
 DANNY B. ROOT, OF CALIFORNIA.
 BARRY C. ROSENTHAL, OF VIRGINIA.
 LLOYD D. SALVETTI, OF VIRGINIA.

JON A. G. SATHER, OF VIRGINIA.
KATHRYN M. SCHALOW, OF WISCONSIN.
JULIE LYN SCHECHTER, OF MASSACHUSETTS.
MICHAEL H. SCHOELLER, OF VIRGINIA.
JOHN T. SCHWEICH, OF VIRGINIA.
JAMES PATRICK SEEVERS, OF THE DISTRICT OF CO-
LUMBIA.

JAMES WESLEY SEWARD, OF WASHINGTON.
ALONZO SIBERT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
LYNN M. SICADE, OF CALIFORNIA.
RODNEY SMITH, OF CALIFORNIA.
JULIA LYNN SPRAATT, OF OHIO.
GINA E. SULLIVAN, OF VIRGINIA.
JOHN C. SULLIVAN, OF CALIFORNIA.
MICHAEL SULLIVAN, OF VIRGINIA.
REBECCA L. TAGGART, OF CALIFORNIA.
LILIANE TASKIN, OF VIRGINIA.
HERBERT A. THOMAS, JR., OF VIRGINIA.
VILMA Y. TURRY, OF PENNSYLVANIA.
RUDOLPH VALOIS, OF TEXAS.
KEVIN M. WALSH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
JOHN ANDREW WECKER, OF CALIFORNIA.
DAVID J. WHIDDON, OF GEORGIA.
ERIC PAUL WHITAKER, OF CALIFORNIA.
KATHERINE LESLIE WOOD, OF VIRGINIA.
JEAN VANDER WOUDE, OF OREGON.
GEORGIA TYSKA WRIGHT, OF MICHIGAN.
STEVEN A. YOUNG, OF FLORIDA.
DIANE R. ZELENY, OF MISSOURI.
STUART A. ZIMMER, JR., OF WASHINGTON.

CONSULAR OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA:
GARY B. PERGL, OF CALIFORNIA.
LOUIS SANTAMARIA, OF FLORIDA.
PATRICK O. SANTILLO, OF MARYLAND.
DANIEL J. YOUNG, OF CALIFORNIA.
SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:
ROBERT EDWARD JACOBSON, JR., OF CALIFORNIA.
JOHN EDGAR PETERS, OF FLORIDA.
DALE TASHARSKI, OF TENNESSEE.
THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE
FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR
PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE
CLASS INDICATED, EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 6, 1988.
CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUN-
SELOR:
TIMOTHY C. BROWN, OF NEVADA.

REAR ADMIRAL PAUL A. WELLING, USCG AS COM-
MANDER, ATLANTIC AREA, UNITED STATES COAST
GUARD WITH THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE SO
SERVING.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GEN-
ERAL'S CORPS OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE
REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADE
INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED
STATES CODE, SECTIONS 611(A) AND 624(C):
To be permanent brigadier general

COL. THOMAS R. CUTHBERT, U.S. ARMY
COL. KENNETH D. GRAY, U.S. ARMY
COL. MALCOLM S. MAGBERRY, U.S. ARMY
COL. ROBERT E. MURRAY, U.S. ARMY

THE UNITED STATES ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OFFI-
CERS NAMED HEREIN FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RE-
SERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE
GRADES INDICATED BELOW, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF
TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 593(A), 3385
AND 3392:
To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN W. CUDMORE, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE
BRIG. GEN. JERRY M. KEETON, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE
BRIG. GEN. JAMES E. MOORE, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE
BRIG. GEN. VITO MORGANO, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE
BRIG. GEN. REYNOLDO SANCHEZ, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE
BRIG. GEN. RICHARD S. SCHNEIDER, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE
BRIG. GEN. HAROLD J. SYKORA, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE
BRIG. GEN. NORMAND A. TRUDEAU, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE
BRIG. GEN. JAMES R. WILLIAMS, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE
BRIG. GEN. WAYNE F. WAGNER, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE

COL. PHILLIP M. BECKER, U.S. ARMY
COL. DAVID D. BOLAND, U.S. ARMY
COL. WILLIAM MIRANDA-MARIN, U.S. ARMY
COL. HERBERT G. STOCKING, U.S. ARMY
COL. TERRY J. TYLER, U.S. ARMY
COL. BOBBY H. ARMISTEAD, U.S. ARMY
COL. HERBERT B. EAGON, U.S. ARMY
COL. JOSEPH GALIOTO, U.S. ARMY
COL. RODNEY R. HANNULA, U.S. ARMY
COL. RONALD A. HOPPE, U.S. ARMY
COL. JOSEPH H. LANGLEY, U.S. ARMY
COL. JOHN B. RAMEY, U.S. ARMY
COL. RICHARD M. RUSCH, U.S. ARMY
COL. STANHOPE S. SPEARS, U.S. ARMY
COL. TONY L. STANSBERRY, U.S. ARMY
COL. HOYT E. THOMPSON, U.S. ARMY
COL. WYLLIE A. ABERCROMBIE, U.S. ARMY
COL. MICHAEL W. DAVIDSON, U.S. ARMY
COL. THOMAS M. FRAZER, U.S. ARMY
COL. DONALD E. HAGGLUND, U.S. ARMY

COL. CHARLES W. FULKERSON, U.S. NAVY
IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAPTAINS IN THE LINE OF
THE UNITED STATES NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE
PERMANENT GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF),
PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION
624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PRO-
VIDED BY LAW:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER
To be rear admiral (lower half)
CAPT. DAVID S. BILL III, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. MICHAEL W. BORDY, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. FRANK L. BOWMAN, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. HERBERT A. BROWNE, JR., U.S. NAVY
CAPT. ARTHUR K. CEBROWSKI, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. VERNON E. CLARK, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. WINFORD G. ELLIS, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. ANDREW A. GRANUZZO, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. FRED P. GUSTAVSON, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. WILLIAM B. HAYDEN, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. FRANCIS K. HOLIAN, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. ALEXANDER J. KRENGICH, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. JOHN M. LUECKE, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. JOHN J. MAZACH, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. LEONARD N. ODEN, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. JOHN R. RYAN, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. SCOTT L. SEARNS, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. JOHN F. SIGLER, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. BERNARD J. SMITH, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. JOHN W. SNYDER, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. ERNEST F. TEDESCHI, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. RONALD D. TUCKER, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. EDISON L. WATKINS, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. WILLIAM H. WRIGHT IV, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. JOHN J. ZERR, U.S. NAVY

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER
To be rear admiral (lower half)
CAPT. MICHAEL T. COYLE, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. JOHN T. MITCHELL, JR., U.S. NAVY

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER
To be rear admiral (lower half)
CAPT. WILLIAM J. TINSTON, JR., U.S. NAVY
SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (CRYPTOLOGY)
To be rear admiral (lower half)

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (INTELLIGENCE)
To be rear admiral (lower half)
CAPT. MICHAEL W. CRAMER, U.S. NAVY
SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (OCEANOGRAPHY)
To be rear admiral (lower half)
CAPT. JOHN E. CHUBB, JR., U.S. NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAPTAINS IN THE STAFF
CORPS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY FOR PROMOTION
TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER
HALF), PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE,
SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR
AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

MEDICAL CORPS
To be rear admiral (lower half)
CAPT. RICHARD A. NELSON, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. FREDERIC G. SANFORD, U.S. NAVY

SUPPLY CORPS
To be rear admiral (lower half)
CAPT. JOHN G. HEKMAN, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. DAVID R. RUBLE, U.S. NAVY
CAPT. LEONARD VINCENT, U.S. NAVY

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS
To be rear admiral (lower half)
CAPT. GEORGE B. ESTES, U.S. NAVY

DENTAL CORPS
To be rear admiral (lower half)
CAPT. WILLIAM H. SNELL, JR., U.S. NAVY

NURSE CORPS
To be rear admiral (lower half)
CAPT. MARIANN STRATON, U.S. NAVY

IN THE MARINE CORPS
THE FOLLOWING NAMED BRIGADIER GENERALS OF
THE U.S. MARINE CORPS FOR PROMOTION TO THE PER-
MANENT GRADE OF MAJOR GENERAL, UNDER THE PRO-
VISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:
RICHARD L. PHILLIPS GEORGE R. CHRISTMAS
ROBERT A. TIEBOUT HAROLD W. BLOT
JAMES E. LIVINGSTON JAMES M. MYATT

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE PERMANENT GRADE INDICATED IN THE MARINE
CORPS RESERVE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10,
UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

To be major general
BRIG. GEN. JOHN F. CRONIN, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE PERMANENT GRADE INDICATED IN THE MARINE
CORPS RESERVE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10,
UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

To be brigadier general
COL. LARRY S. TAYLOR, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE

IN THE AIR FORCE
THE FOLLOWING-NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINT-
MENT AS RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE (ANGUS) IN THE
GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SEC-
TIONS 593 AND 831, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH
A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF
SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PER-
FORM DUTIES AS INDICATED.

MEDICAL CORPS
To be colonel
GRANDE, DONALD J., U.S. NAVY
THE FOLLOWING-NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINT-
MENT AS RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE (ANGUS) IN THE
GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SEC-
TIONS 593 AND 831, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH
A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF
SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PER-
FORM DUTIES AS INDICATED.

MEDICAL CORPS
To be lieutenant colonel
BRUCE, CHARLES O., III, U.S. NAVY, 9 MAY 90
PADILLA, CARLOS R., U.S. NAVY, 28 APR 90
WILSON, DON E., U.S. NAVY, 1 JUL 90

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED
STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF
THE AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 593
AND 8379, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. PROMOTIONS
MADE UNDER SECTION 8379 AND CONFIRMED BY THE SEN-
ATE UNDER SECTION 593 SHALL BEAR AN EFFECTIVE
DATE ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 8374,
TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE
To be lieutenant colonel
MAJ. DAVID W. BAUMANN, U.S. NAVY, 24 JUL 90
MAJ. WILLIAM M. BEUTEL, U.S. NAVY, 21 AUG 90
MAJ. BLAINE D. COFFEY, JR., U.S. NAVY, 20 SEP 90
MAJ. ANTHONY A. D'AGUILLO, U.S. NAVY, 5 SEP 90
MAJ. REGINALD E. GIRDHARRY, U.S. NAVY, 25 AUG 90
MAJ. STEPHEN A. JAMESON, U.S. NAVY, 17 SEP 90
MAJ. JACOB J. LEISLE, U.S. NAVY, 10 SEP 90
MAJ. NORMAN D. LILLYBETH, U.S. NAVY, 12 SEP 90
MAJ. RICHARD L. LOHNES, U.S. NAVY, 29 AUG 90
MAJ. JOSEPH E. LUCAS, U.S. NAVY, 6 SEP 90
MAJ. MARION J. MARTIN, U.S. NAVY, 1 OCT 90
MAJ. RONALD J. MARUSIAN, U.S. NAVY, 8 SEP 90
MAJ. DALE A. MOCHKO, U.S. NAVY, 30 AUG 90
MAJ. DEANNA D. OLIVER, U.S. NAVY, 23 JUL 90
MAJ. PATRICK N. ROUNDS, U.S. NAVY, 7 SEP 90
MAJ. STEVEN L. TAYLOR, U.S. NAVY, 14 JUL 90
MAJ. CRAIG E. THORSON, U.S. NAVY, 6 SEP 90
MAJ. STEVEN C. WIDEN, U.S. NAVY, 30 AUG 90
MAJ. DENNIS G. WOODS, U.S. NAVY, 22 AUG 90

CHAPLAIN CORPS
MAJ. RICHARD G. LAWRENZ, U.S. NAVY, 9 SEP 90

MEDICAL SERVICES CORPS
MAJ. TIMOTHY M. ADAMS, U.S. NAVY, 9 SEP 90

MEDICAL CORPS
MAJ. WILLIAM L. CARVETH, U.S. NAVY, 16 SEP 90
MAJ. KENT B. MURRAY, U.S. NAVY, 15 SEP 90
MAJ. MARK W. PARKER, U.S. NAVY, 9 SEP 90

DENTAL CORPS
MAJ. JOHN R. CARNAHAN, U.S. NAVY, 12 SEP 90

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED
STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF
THE AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 593
AND 8379, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE. PROM-
OTIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 8379 AND CONFIRMED BY
THE SENATE UNDER SECTION 593 SHALL BEAR AN EFFECT-
IVE DATE ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SEC-
TION 8374, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE
To be lieutenant colonel
MAJ. DOUGLAS S. ANDERSON, U.S. NAVY, 5 AUG 90
MAJ. EUGENE W. BRANDEWIE, U.S. NAVY, 29 AUG 90
MAJ. ROBERT R. CARLSON, U.S. NAVY, 14 AUG 90
MAJ. KENNETH B. CAUDILL, U.S. NAVY, 10 MAY 90
MAJ. SIG A. DEHN, U.S. NAVY, 18 AUG 90
MAJ. TERRY A. GRAYBEAL, U.S. NAVY, 12 AUG 90
MAJ. BRIAN C. HAGGERTY, U.S. NAVY, 1 JUL 90
MAJ. RONALD A. HALE, JR., U.S. NAVY, 3 AUG 90
MAJ. MARK W. HAYDEN, U.S. NAVY, 28 JUL 90
MAJ. SAMUEL E. HAMES, U.S. NAVY, 4 AUG 90
MAJ. JOSEPH W. JOHNSON, JR., U.S. NAVY, 5 AUG 90
MAJ. ELMER D. MAXFIELD, U.S. NAVY, 4 AUG 90

MAJ. GERALD C. OLESEN, xxx-xx-x, 26 JUL 90
 MAJ. MICHAEL W. PAUL, xxx-xx-x, 11 AUG 90
 MAJ. PATRICK J. PAUL, xxx-xx-x, 18 AUG 90
 MAJ. JOSEPH PELUSO, xxx-xx-x, 18 AUG 90
 MAJ. ALBERT L. PHILLIPS, JR., xxx-xx-x, 4 SEP 90
 MAJ. DAVID G. PHILLIPS, JR., xxx-xx-x, 4 AUG 90
 MAJ. DAVID L. PIFER, xxx-xx-x, 8 JUL 90
 MAJ. LEONARD J. PRINCE, xxx-xx-x, 21 AUG 90
 MAJ. DAVID L. SANGER, xxx-xx-x, 17 JUL 90
 MAJ. JAMES P. STEFFEL, xxx-xx-x, 17 JUL 90
 MAJ. ROY T. STEWART, xxx-xx-x, 1 AUG 90
 MAJ. ERNEST G. TALBERT, xxx-xx-x, 22 AUG 90

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERALS DEPARTMENT

MAJ. JAMES R. MARSHALL, xxx-xx-x, 31 JUL 90

CHAPLAIN CORPS

MAJ. GERALD T. STONE, xxx-xx-x, 5 AUG 90

MEDICAL CORPS

MAJ. JOHN A. BRODSTON, xxx-xx-x, 4 AUG 90

MAJ. WILLIAM E. ZOESCH, xxx-xx-x, 5 AUG 90

MAJ. JOSEPH M. ZOMPA, xxx-xx-x, 1 AUG 90

NURSE CORPS

MAJ. ELWOOD J. HUMMEL, JR., xxx-xx-x, 4 AUG 90

DENTAL CORPS

MAJ. VALERIE SCHILLER, xxx-xx-x, 27 JUL 90

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, AS AMENDED, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

To be major

NICOLAS, GEORGE, JR., xxx-xx-x

JUDGE ADVOCATE

DRENAN, MICHAEL D., xxx-xx-x

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

YOUNG, JAMES L., xxx-xx-x

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 9067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM THE DUTIES INDICATED, PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL THE OFFICER BE APPOINTED IN A GRADE HIGHER THAN INDICATED.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

YOUNG, JAMES L., xxx-xx-x

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

To be major

NICOLAS, GEORGE, JR., xxx-xx-x

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTIONS 624 AND 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK ARE ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

*HUGH D. THORFINNSEN, xxx-xx-x

To be lieutenant colonel

CLIFFORD H. THRELKELD, xxx-xx-x

To be major

ELMO R. ACIO, xxx-xx-x

ROBERT B. FINEGOLD, xxx-xx-x

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be major

*PATRICIA A. K. HEETER, xxx-xx-x

ARMY

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH R. EDWARDS, xxx-xx-x

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICER IDENTIFIED BY ASTERISK IS ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

BLATTER, BARBARA, xxx-xx-x

DAIGLE, WADE W., xxx-xx-x

HANCOCK, DEXTER, xxx-xx-x

REID, JAMES A., xxx-xx-x

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be colonel

BARTZ, CLAUDIA C., xxx-xx-x

BEEMAN, THOMAS A., xxx-xx-x

BISKEY, VALERIE D., xxx-xx-x

BLAZIER, COLLEEN D., xxx-xx-x

BLECK, DOROTHY A., xxx-xx-x

BONNELL, JEFFREY A., xxx-xx-x

BRICK, JACQUELINE R., xxx-xx-x

*CARPENTER, CATHARINE, xxx-xx-x

COVINGTON, BARBARA, xxx-xx-x

DUNNING, SHARON L., xxx-xx-x

FRANK, MARY E., xxx-xx-x

FREEMAN, MARGARET, xxx-xx-x

GREENFIELD, ELISABETH, xxx-xx-x

HUDAK, JANE L., xxx-xx-x

JENNINGS, BONNIE J., xxx-xx-x

KADING, STEVEN E., xxx-xx-x

KIEFER, LINDA H., xxx-xx-x

LINKER, LYNDA A., xxx-xx-x

MCFADINMEIS, NANETTE, xxx-xx-x

MOENNOGUERAS, CYNTHIA, xxx-xx-x

MUNDY, CLAUDIA M., xxx-xx-x

NIPPS, MARCELLA A., xxx-xx-x

OREAR, GAYLE A., xxx-xx-x

REHM, ADELE L., xxx-xx-x

RETTIG, FRANNIE M., xxx-xx-x

RIEKER, DENNIS D., xxx-xx-x

ROBINSON, ROSEMARY, xxx-xx-x

STRZELECKI, LORNA R., xxx-xx-x

TURNER, BARBARA S., xxx-xx-x

WATSON, EILEEN K., xxx-xx-x

YIP, GAR, xxx-xx-x

ZIMMERMAN, CAROL H., xxx-xx-x

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

BACH KEVIN K	BRUHA PAUL J
BATTAGLIA MICHAEL J	CLEMENTS LLOYD S
CAMPBELL GREGORY S	DANG MASON X
CULVINER WILLIAM T	DELEON LILLIAN I
DELAGRUZ RICHARD A	DOWNS WALTER M
DOMMERMUTH RONALD F	ELLIOTT MICHAEL J
DUNCAN TIMOTHY D	GILL-RESEBER GEORGIA L
FRENCH TONIANNE	GRIFFO TRUDI E
GLUCK CARLA I	HARMON SUSAN M
HARMON DAVID A	HILDERBRANDT M
HARRISON MICHAEL J	HANSJOACHIM A
KLINKO CHRISTOPHER J	KUHSE MARK B
LAND DAVID A	LANKIN KENNETH M
LARCOMBE JOEL W	LOCKE JOHN S
MARTIN ROBERT P	MCGUIRE JEFFREY D
MELBOURNE MARIA H	MERRILL BARTH E
NELSON CHRISTOPHER M	NIEVES NELSON A
ODONNELL EILEEN M	PEARSE LISA A
PORTOUW STEVEN J	POWELL CURTIS R
SALT GRAIG J	SCHNEIDER JAY
SHARPE RICHARD P	SHERMAN STERLING S
STONER MICHAEL C	TANNER WILLIAM J
THIBAUT PRISCILLA A	THOMAS KEVIN D
VIA DARIN K	WILLIAMS ALLEN M
BALOG DANIEL J	

MANUEL V. ORDONEZ, NAVY ENLISTED COMMISSIONING PROGRAM CANDIDATE, TO BE APPOINTED ENSIGN IN THE LINE OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED DISTINGUISHED NAVAL GRADUATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OR STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

AYER, AARON J.	BAUDOIN, DAVID L.
COX, C. A.	HARSHANY, E. T.
HAYCRAFT, DAVID D.	KEOUGH, DAVID A.
KOST, E. J.	MARTY, JEFFREY L.
MORTON, DARREN C.	PAPPAS, MICHAEL P.
ROLAND, W. B.	RUSSO, WILLIAM A.
SCHROEDER, THEODORE H.	WUCKOWITZSCH, ROBERT T.

JAMES E. LEE, CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER, W-4, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, TO BE REAPPOINTED A TEMPORARY CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER, W-4, IN THE U.S. NAVY FROM THE TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIRED LIST, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1211.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED EX-U.S. NAVY OFFICERS TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593:

CALEBAUGH, DONALD L. HUDSON, CHARLES C.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED EX-U.S. NAVY RESERVE OFFICERS TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593:

HUNT, PHILLIP D. SLEMMONS, DANIEL H. GRIFFITH E. QUINBY, JR., MEDICAL COLLEGE GRADUATE, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593.

FREDERICK E. MILLARD, U.S. NAVY OFFICER, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593.

THOMAS V. MOORE, U.S. NAVY OFFICERS, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE LINE OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593.

IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING CANDIDATES FOR PERSONNEL ACTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREOF AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS:

To be medical director

ALAN R. BAKER

To be senior surgeon

EDWARD L. BAKER, JR.	WALTER A. ORENSTEIN
JOHN H. CHRISTOPHERSON	MARK L. ROSENBERG

To be surgeon

LARRY J. ANDERSON	WILLIAM R. JARVIS
JAMES W. BUEHLER	MARK A. KNEPPER
TIMOTHY R. CAVANAGH	PHUC NGUYEN-DINH
GORDON B. CUTLER, JR.	MARTHA F. ROGERS
VAN S. HUBBARD	JAMES H. SHELHAMER

To be senior assistant surgeon

ARTHUR V. BERMISA	NEIL J. MURPHY
CYNTHIA M. BRENNAN	BERNARD L. NAHLEN
AURELIO GALATI	STEPHEN J. RITH-NAJARIAN
THOMAS P. GROSS	JOHN W. WARD
JOHN R. LIVENGWOOD	
BONITA D. MALIT	

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

TERRENCE S. BATLINER	KEVIN S. HARDWICK
THOMAS L. BERMEL	RODNEY F. KIRK
MICHAEL L. CAMPSMITH	MARGARET L. LAMY
WILLIAM L. CANADA	JAMES C. SINGLETON
MICHAEL H. CANGEMI	WAYNE G. STERBA
ANDREW C. CASTERLINE	PAUL YOUNG
CHARLES J. EDELEN	

To be senior assistant nurse officer

LUELLA M. BROWN	YECHIAM OSTCHEGA
JAMES E. CLEVENGER	GLADYS V. PERKINS
LAVERNE M. GREEN	ELNORA A. QUALLS
RUSSELL L. GREEN	PATRICE A. ROBB
MARTHA L. HAYNES	DEBORAH A. ROBESZ
MARK W. HUNT	CHRISTINE L. RUBADUE
MERRIT C. JENSEN	KATHLEEN C. STUMP
DORSEY C. LECOMPT	EDITH L. SUAREZ
KENNETH H. MARMON	CHARLES R. VANANDEN, III
REBECCA K. OLIN	ELLEN E. WOLF

To be assistant nurse officer

CHERYL P. CHAPMAN	ROBERT W. MAYES
MICHAEL W. JONES	JOHN J. ROSENBERGER

To be senior assistant engineer officer

TIMOTHY G. AMSTUTZ	JEFFREY B. MASHBURN
THOMAS H. COOLIDGE	DANIEL G. MCLAUGHLIN
VALERIE J. HANEY	PETER C. PIRILLO, JR.
DANIEL L. HEINTZMAN	RICHARD A. RUBENDALL

To be senior assistant scientist

JOHN E. ABRAHAM	BARRY S. FIELDS
RICKIE R. DAVIS	SARA DEE MCARTHUR

To be sanitarian

THOMAS N. HUNT

To be senior assistant sanitarian

RUSSELL E. ENSCORE	SHAWN W. GOOGINS
--------------------	------------------

To be assistant sanitarian

BRIAN E. CAGLE

To be veterinary officer

MARLENE N. COLE	JOHN C. DONOVAN
-----------------	-----------------

To be pharmacist

SUSAN CARL

To be senior assistant pharmacist

RODNEY M. BAUER	ANTHONY R. KUYPER
THOMAS W. BOROUGHS	SHEILA M. OKEEFE
RANDY W. BURDEN	CECILIA-MARINA PRELA
DIANA L. DAVIS	ROBERT W. RIST
MARTIN JAGERS	CYNTHIA D. ROACH

To be assistant pharmacist

DAVID B. BAKKEN	MARY A. FONG
-----------------	--------------

To be senior assistant dietitian

KENNETH W. SOUZA	MIRANDA S. YANG-OSHIDA
------------------	------------------------

To be senior assistant therapist

LOUIS N. IANNUZZI	FRANCES M. OAKLEY
DAVID E. NESTOR	

To be health services officer

VIVIAN T. CHEN	RONALD G. FREEMAN
----------------	-------------------

To be senior assistant health services officer

EUGENE G. DANNELS MICHELE M. MORIN
PAUL W. HOLLAND

To be assistant health services officer

JAMES R. DAILY MARIA E. STETTER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH GRADE AND DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL ANY OF THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS BE APPOINTED IN A GRADE HIGHER THAN CAPTAIN.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

STEVEN L. ABERNATHY
BRYAN B. ACHER
TIMOTHY J. ADAM
JEFFREY V. ADAMS
REGINALD C. ADAMS
THOMAS J. ADDISON
SAM RALPH AIDUN
CATHERINE A.M. AHYE
JOHN F. AKERS, JR
FRANK S. ALEXA
MICHAEL G. ALEXANDER
CHRISTOPHER A. ALFIERI
MARK G. ALLCOTT
GREGORY R. ALLEN
ETHAN R. ALLISON
JOHN C. ALLISON
ROBIN M. ALMAN
PATRICK J. ALSUP
ANTOINETTE R. AMAYA
FREDERICK R. ANDERSEN
CHRISTOPHER L. ANDERSON
DOUGLAS R. ANDERSON
E. WEST ANDERSON
JACK D. ANDERSON
ROBERT ANDERSON
ROBERT C. ANDERSON
ROBERT G. ANDERSON
GREGG D. ANDREACCHI
EMMANUEL E. ANTIMISIAKIS
PAUL R. ARMSTRONG
SCOTT A. ARVIN
MATTHEW B. ASH
ROBERT L. ASHCROFT
THOMAS G. ATKINS
TERRY D. ATWOOD
KENNETH A. AUSTIN
ROBERT W. AUSTIN
KATHERINE AUZENNE
TODD M. AVERY
JAMES M. BACHMUR
ROBERT L. BADY
THOMAS A. BAERWALL
BRIAN D. BAILEY
JEFFERY A. BAILEY
JIMMY C. BAILEY
SEAN P. BAILEY
WILLIAM F. BAIER
ANTHONY R. BAIT
DAVID E. BAKER, JR
JAY E. BAKER, II
PAUL E. BALKER
KIMBERLY J. BALKEMA
KENNETH E. BANDY
DALE R. BANGHART
RENEE P. BARBER
JOHN M. BARELKA
JEFFREY S. BARGEN
THEODORE H. BARLOCK
GORDON J. BARLOW
LAWRENCE E. BARNARD
CORTNEY H. BARNES
RICHARD A. BARNES, JR
ROBERT C. BARNES
DOUGLAS C. BARNETT
PATRICK A. BARNETT
ROBERT S. BARON
TIMOTHY T. BARRINGTON
SHELDON W. BARTHOLOMEW
LARRY D. BARTLETT
KIMBERLY A. BARTON
WILLIAM H. BATEMAN
LAWRENCE J. BATES
TITO L. BATTAGLIOLI
JOHN BAUER, JR
BUD E. BAUGHMAN
GARY J. BAUMAN
CYNTHIA L. BAUM
RONALD A. BAUMANN
HEIDI L. BEASON
CHARLES J. BECK
JEFFREY A. BECK
WILLIAM J. BECKER
CHARLES E. BECKWITH
WILLIAM D. BEEBE
BENJAMIN C. BEELER
TIMOTHY R. BELL
BILLY E. BELT, JR
WILSON M. BEN
SUZANNE S. BENSON
VERNON B. BENTON
THOMAS W. BERGLUND
DANIEL L. BERKOWITZ
PAUL K. BERRY

RICHARD T. BILEY
RICHARD S. BINGER
GEORGE P. BIONDI
CHRISTOPHER L. BIRGE
MANFRED A. BISCHOFF
BRUCE C. BISER
DONALD L. BISHOP
VOLKER M. BITTNER
BRUCE H. BLACK
TODD A. BLACK
CHARLES C. BLACKWELL
CRYSTAL D. BLALOCK
GREGORY O. BLANCHARD
MARK A. BLISS
DAVID S. BLOCKER
THOMAS P. BOITANO
ANNETTE V. BOLEN
WINFIELD S. BOLLINGER, II
ROBERT D. BOLT
JACQUELINE BOLTON
CHARLES R. BOONS
KEVIN A. BOOTH
JOHN W. BORGMAN
WILLIAM J. BORRAS
RALPH F. BORSETT
DALE S. BOSSELMANN
LOUIS BOYKIN, JR
ANTHONY G. BRADLEY
BRENT A. BRADLEY
ROB D. BRANDT
TODD W. BRANN
DAVID M. BRANNAN
SCOTT W. BREIT
MICHAEL L. BRICKNER
DONALD S. BRIGGS
DAVID D. BROOK
MICHAEL J. BROOKS
ROBERT A. BROOKS
ROGER G. BROOKS
DAVID A. BROWN
FRANCIS M. BROWN
JONATHAN D. BROWN
THOMAS W. BROWN
TRACY D. BROWN
JIMMY D. BROYLES
KENNETH G. BROYLES
ROBIN R. BRUNNER
JAMES M. BRUNN
MICHAEL J. BRUNSON
CHARLES R. BRUNN
WALTER A. BRYAN, JR
KENNETH J. BRYANT
PAUL R. BRYANT
JOSEPH S. BUCH
KARL A. BUCHHEITZER
STANLEY J. BUELL
JOHN J. BULATI
GREGORY A. BULLETT
LANCE B. BULLER
DANIEL E. BULLOCH
JAMES B. BUNKER
DAVID J. BUNKER
MICHAEL J. BURCHAM
ERIK D. BURGESSON
STEVEN D. BURGESS
ROBYN M. BURK
RODNEY A. BURNETT
DAVID J. BURUD
PETER L. BUSSA
MARK J. BUTORAC
DUANE D. BYNUM
ERNEST L. CAFFEY, JR
LYNN F. CAFISO
JAMES E. CALLEN
ROBERT G. CAMPBELL
MICHAEL I. CARAWAY
JEFFREY D. CARLTON
ALAN E. CARTER
MARK L. CARTER
THORLOUGH E. CARTER, JR
CINDY L. CASEY
DOUGLAS R. CASSELLA
GLEN A. CATANIA
SALVATORE CATTANZARU
JAMES M. CAVANAGH
ALAN S. CAZARES
SCOTT E. CERILLA
GEORGE F. CHAMPLAIN
WALTER H. CHASE, II
LINDA K. CHICK
MARK D. CHIFFET
CHRISTOPHER C. CHUTE
BARBARA L. CIESLICH
RONALD G. CIELEK
JAMES C. CIZEK
EDDY G. CLARK
GARY N. CLARK
JOHN B. CLARK
JOHN R. CLARK
MICHAEL J. CLARKE
DAVID L. CLARKE
DANIEL E. CLEARWATER
RANDALL L. CLEMENSON
WILLIAM D. COBB
JOSEPH C. CODIROLO
REBECCA S. COLAW
DONALD J. COLEMAN
THOMAS W. COLEMAN, III
EDWARD A. COLLEY
DOUGLAS S. COLLINS
GENE T. COLLINSWORTH
CHARLES C. COMPTON

ADA A. CONLAN
DAVID CONLEY
CHRISTOPHER M. CONNELLY
WILLIAM G. CONRAD, JR
WILLIAM J. CONROY
RANDY E. COOK
WILLIAM T. COOK, JR
ALAN G. COONCE
PHILIP S. COOPER
JAMES R. CORBETT
GLEN A. CORELLI
DONNALISA CORNELIO
AIMEE S. CORNING
MARK E. CORRELL, SR
EUGENE T. COTTLE
MARILYN T. COTTRELL
JAMES P. COVELL
DAVID E. COWAN
KATHRYN M. CRACE
LEE R. CRANMER
RANDAL A. CRAVEN
CHRISTOPHER T. CRAWLEY
TERRY A. CREACH
PAMELA A. CREASY
CHRISTOPHER M. CRENSHAW
DWAYNE L. CROSBY
JEFFREY G. CULBERTSON
STEPHEN G. CUNICO
STEVEN W. CURLEY
GERALD D. CURRY
BRENT G. CURTIS
WILLIAM R. CUSTER, JR
TIMOTHY S. CUTLER
EDWARD T. CYRUS
ESSA C. DABBIKER
DAYLE F. DABNEY
ADAM J. DABROWSKI
ROBERT E. DAHL
ADOLFO L. DANGUILLECOURT
MARK A. DANIS
ROBERT E. DARR
WILLIAM E. DARRELL
MICHAEL J. DASBACH
DOUGLAS W. DAUER
TIMOTHY D. DAVIDSON
GREGORY S. DAVIS
LAWRENCE E. DAVIS, JR
LYDIA L. DAVIS
THERON G. DAVIS
JEFFREY T. DAVIS
CLIFFORD E. DAY
LEE H. DAYTON
THOMAS P. DEELEY
DARLENE K. DEJESUS
MARK E. DEMERS
NIKOLAS M. DEMIDMICHILLI
RONALD R. DENLEY
BARNETT C. DENNON
GERALD E. DENNON
CHARLES M. DENNY
MICHAEL S. DERSEHEM
JON R. DETERMAN
DARRELL J. DEWITT
MILTON E. DIAZ
BRADLEY A. DICKS
MARK C. DILLON
FRANK DINARDO, JR
DAREN W. DIRKSE
MARK A. DIVICH
ELVIS C. DIXON
GLENADA M. DIXON
CHRISTOPHER A. DONAHUE
BRADLEY J. DONNELLAN
CHRISTOPHER M. DORS
MICHAEL J. DOUBLIN
JOSHUA H. DOUGLAS
BARRY N. DOWELL
MARY S. DOWLING
DARYL C. DOWNING
MARK D. DRALLE
KEVIN B. DRISCOLL
DEBORAH L. DUBAY
SCOTT C. DUDLEY
THOMAS B. DUER
SEAN P. DUFFY
STEFFEN P. DUNGAN
NEAL P. DUNHAM
KENNETH G. DUNHAM
GARY P. DUNKERLEY
DENIS F. DURAND
JAMES E. DWYER
DARRELL R. DYER
RICHARD B. DYER
JORGE H. ECHEVERRIE
RONNIE E. EDGE
RICHARD M. EDMONDS
JOHN M. EGENTOWICH
ARTHUR G. EGGERS
JOHN M. EHRENREICH
JOHN J. EHRENREICH
PAUL R. EICHENLAUB
DAVID S. EK
MICHAEL W. ELLIOTT
MICHAEL W. ELLIOTT
JAMES P. ELLIS
STEVEN M. ELLIS
GREGORY T. ENGLISH
MARK D. ENGEMAN
JOHN D. ENKING
ROGER P. EPPS
WILLIAM W. ERBAUGH, JR
NEIL B. ERNO

GARY O. ESSARY xxx-xx-x
 NEIL B. ESTENSON xxx-xx-x
 ANTONY J. ETIENNE xxx-xx-x
 DAVID R. EVANS xxx-xx-x
 JOHN A. EVANS xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL A. EWELL xxx-xx-x
 DALE T. FADLEY xxx-xx-x
 MYRNA L. FAGAN xxx-xx-x
 RONALD R. FAIRBANKS xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES W. FALKENMAYER JR xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY K. FARLESS xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL D. FARMER xxx-xx-x
 JOHN P. FARNER xxx-xx-x
 DONALD G. FARRIS xxx-xx-x
 JERREL D. FARRIS, JR xxx-xx-x
 TIMOTHY S. FARVER xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS E. FELDHUIS xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL G. FELLER xxx-xx-x
 JOHN N. FELLSHER xxx-xx-x
 DAVID A. FENNELLS xxx-xx-x
 JAMES C. FERGUSON xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM K. FETZNER xxx-xx-x
 PHILIP R. FICHTHORN xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT J. FIELDING xxx-xx-x
 ROGELIO B. FIGUEROA xxx-xx-x
 JAY C. FISH xxx-xx-x
 JAMES A. FITTS, JR xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL B. FITZGERALD xxx-xx-x
 DWAYNE H. FLORENZIE xxx-xx-x
 BRIAN C. FORD xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH R. FORD xxx-xx-x
 PETER D. FORD, III xxx-xx-x
 MARK S. FORESTER xxx-xx-x
 TROY A. FORTMANN xxx-xx-x
 KAREN A. FOSS xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL C. FOSTER xxx-xx-x
 JOSEPH F. FOURNIER, JR xxx-xx-x
 DAWN S. FRANCIS xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD L. FRANKEL xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH G. FRANKOVICH xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL B. FRASHER xxx-xx-x
 CLAY R. FRASIER xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS W. FRAZIER xxx-xx-x
 ABDULMALIK FREEMAN xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL FREEMAN xxx-xx-x
 KEVIN D. FRESSE xxx-xx-x
 LEONARD W. FRITZ, JR xxx-xx-x
 CURTIS V. FROST xxx-xx-x
 DARLENE M. FRYBERGER xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD T. FUENTES xxx-xx-x
 DAVID W. FUNK xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD G. FURBER xxx-xx-x
 SHENG P. FYOCK xxx-xx-x
 GARY C. GAGNON xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY D. GALBRAITH xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT M. GALBRAITH xxx-xx-x
 JAMES M. GALLAGHER xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL GALVEZ xxx-xx-x
 RONALD J. GANAN, JR xxx-xx-x
 FRED GARCIA xxx-xx-x
 LEE J. GARCIA xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH L. GARDNER xxx-xx-x
 JOHN A. GARNER xxx-xx-x
 JAMES E. GARNETT xxx-xx-x
 DAVID A. GAROFALO xxx-xx-x
 JOHN R. GARRETT xxx-xx-x
 RANDELL D. GARRETT xxx-xx-x
 ALLAN J. GARRIDO xxx-xx-x
 ANDRE L. GATHERS xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY T. GAVIN xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS L. GAYLORD xxx-xx-x
 STEFANIE A. GAYTON xxx-xx-x
 CHRISTINE R. GEDNEY xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL E. GELINAS xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY F. GELLER xxx-xx-x
 JOSEPH R. GELLER xxx-xx-x
 BRADLEY E. GERKEN xxx-xx-x
 DENNIS J. GERVAIS xxx-xx-x
 RANDAL A. GESCHEIDLE xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. GIBBONS xxx-xx-x
 SIDNEY L. GIBSON xxx-xx-x
 RALPH M. GIESLER xxx-xx-x
 DON W. GILLEAN xxx-xx-x
 SCOTT C. GILLESPIE xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL V. GILSDORF xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS W. GIMMY xxx-xx-x
 FRANK A. GLIDWELL, JR xxx-xx-x
 MANUEL J. GOMES xxx-xx-x
 EDUARDO GONZALEZ xxx-xx-x
 JOHN D. GOODWIN xxx-xx-x
 WARREN E. GOOL xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD O. GORDON xxx-xx-x
 WALLACE C. GOWIN xxx-xx-x
 LEWIS C. GRAEFF xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL A. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x
 NICALOS V. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES B. GRANADA xxx-xx-x
 JON K. GRAY xxx-xx-x
 COLIN E. GREEN xxx-xx-x
 JAMES D. GREEN xxx-xx-x
 NATHAN E. GREEN xxx-xx-x
 MARK T. GREENE xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT L. GREENWOOD xxx-xx-x
 SCOTT W. GREENWOOD xxx-xx-x
 MARTIN J. GRECHIK xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY R. GRIFFIN xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL A. GRIFFIN xxx-xx-x
 KELLY A. GRIFFITH xxx-xx-x
 GARY R. GRIMES xxx-xx-x
 DAVID T. GROENDEYK xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH H. GRUDZINSKI xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY C. GRUVER xxx-xx-x

ANDRE G. GUIANG xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. HAAK xxx-xx-x
 JAMES E. HAGEN xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL A. HAGER xxx-xx-x
 SAMUEL E. HAGINS xxx-xx-x
 DAVID L. HALE xxx-xx-x
 GARRY L. HALL xxx-xx-x
 LARRY D. HALL xxx-xx-x
 RONALD J. HALL xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS A. HALL xxx-xx-x
 TONY R. HALL xxx-xx-x
 HERBERT J. HALSTAD xxx-xx-x
 RODNEY D. HAMILTON xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM R. HAMILTON xxx-xx-x
 LARRY G. HAMMER xxx-xx-x
 JOSEPH L. HAMRICK, II xxx-xx-x
 GARTH M. HANEY xxx-xx-x
 ARLENE B. HANKINS xxx-xx-x
 LAURA A. HANKINS xxx-xx-x
 JERROLD J. HANNA xxx-xx-x
 DAVID A. HANNINGTON xxx-xx-x
 BRIAN M. HANSEN xxx-xx-x
 DUANE T. HANSEN xxx-xx-x
 VINCENT F. HAPGOOD xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL T. HARDER xxx-xx-x
 GARY L. HARDING xxx-xx-x
 DAVID L. HARDY xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM H. HARLEY, III xxx-xx-x
 GEOFFREY T. HARRIS xxx-xx-x
 JACKSON S. HARRIS, JR xxx-xx-x
 JAMES G. HARRIS xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL A. HARTLEY xxx-xx-x
 MARK H. HARTLINE xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT J. HARTNETT, JR xxx-xx-x
 MARK R. HASARA xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT CHARLES HASL xxx-xx-x
 BRIAN D. HASTINGS xxx-xx-x
 JOSEPH P. HATHAWAY xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD L. HAUGLAND xxx-xx-x
 CONNIE K. HAWLEY xxx-xx-x
 LESLIE R. HAYDEN xxx-xx-x
 BROOKE E. HAYNES xxx-xx-x
 PETER G. HAYS xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS Y. HEADEN xxx-xx-x
 BRIAN C. HEALY xxx-xx-x
 PAUL R. HESCHEN xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL G. HEFFNER xxx-xx-x
 SUSAN M. HEGEDUSICH xxx-xx-x
 JULIE A. HEITZMAN xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT L. HEMPHILL xxx-xx-x
 STEVEN J. HENNESSY xxx-xx-x
 YUN HEO xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT J. HEPPNER xxx-xx-x
 JERRY E. HERBEL, JR xxx-xx-x
 JOSE L. HERNANDEZ, JR xxx-xx-x
 DAVID J. HERRING xxx-xx-x
 GLENN E. HERRON xxx-xx-x
 TRAVIS J. HESTILOW xxx-xx-x
 GARY D. HETLAND xxx-xx-x
 ISALAH HEYWARD xxx-xx-x
 JOHN R. HICKEY xxx-xx-x
 DENNIS C. HIGGINS xxx-xx-x
 PETER HIGGINS xxx-xx-x
 WILFRED N. HIGGINS xxx-xx-x
 ANTHONY C. HIGUERA xxx-xx-x
 MARK A. HILDEBRANDT xxx-xx-x
 DAVID E. HILL xxx-xx-x
 SCOTT T. HILL xxx-xx-x
 SAMUEL D. HILLMON xxx-xx-x
 RAY T. HIRATA xxx-xx-x
 TUAN A. HOANG xxx-xx-x
 JAMES H. HOBDAY xxx-xx-x
 DOUGLAS J. HOCK xxx-xx-x
 STEVEN S. HOPFSTADT xxx-xx-x
 GEORGE J. HOGAN xxx-xx-x
 JOHN P. HOGAN xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS M. HOLDER, JR xxx-xx-x
 BOBBY J. HOLLOWELL xxx-xx-x
 JIMMIE D. HOLMES xxx-xx-x
 ALAN T. HOLT xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT A. HOOD, JR xxx-xx-x
 DAVID A. HOPKINSON xxx-xx-x
 RONALD W. HOPPER xxx-xx-x
 DAUN A. HORTTOR xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD M. HOTCHKISS, JR xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. HOUGHTON xxx-xx-x
 DARRRELL W. HOUTMES xxx-xx-x
 MARK W. HOUTZER xxx-xx-x
 ERIC K. HUBER xxx-xx-x
 MARTIN J. HUGGARD xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH J. HULL xxx-xx-x
 DAVID B. HUME xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD T. HUMPHREY xxx-xx-x
 DAVID P. HUNNINGHAKE xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL J. HUNTER xxx-xx-x
 LORINDA G. HUNTER xxx-xx-x
 TERRY HUNTER xxx-xx-x
 ARTHUR E. HUTCHINSON, JR xxx-xx-x
 OTTIS L. HUTCHINSON, JR xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH J. HYVONEN, JR xxx-xx-x
 VINCENT G. ICENOGLU xxx-xx-x
 JAMES E. ILG xxx-xx-x
 JAMES E. IMLAY xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS M. INGRAM xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY S. INMAN xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL G. ISAACS xxx-xx-x
 DAVID T. ISRAEL xxx-xx-x
 VIRGINIA M. JABOUE xxx-xx-x
 JUDY L. JACKSON xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH F. JACKSON xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT W. JACKSON, JR xxx-xx-x
 CHRISTOPHER CLAUDE JACOBS xxx-xx-x

RICHARD J. JACOBS xxx-xx-x
 FREEMAN E. JAMES xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD E. JENKINS xxx-xx-x
 RUSSELL D. JENSEN xxx-xx-x
 ERIC C. JESSEN xxx-xx-x
 SUSAN L. JESSEN xxx-xx-x
 JOE A. JIMENEZ xxx-xx-x
 ALAN W. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 DAVID R. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 DONALD C. JOHNSON, JR xxx-xx-x
 ERIC A. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 KATHY JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 KEVIN A. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 SCOTT M. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 SPENCER A. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM W. JOHNSON, JR xxx-xx-x
 GAINES T. JOHNSTON xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES E. JONES xxx-xx-x
 DAVID A. JONES xxx-xx-x
 STEPHEN R. JONES xxx-xx-x
 TOBY R. JONES xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM S. JONES xxx-xx-x
 LEWIS C. JORDAN xxx-xx-x
 HOWARD L. JOSEPH xxx-xx-x
 MARK A. JOWYK xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL JOY xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY A. KADRITIK xxx-xx-x
 JOSE J. KALIL xxx-xx-x
 ISABEL M. KALOCSAY xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS L. KAMMERER xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL S. KAPEL xxx-xx-x
 CHRISTOPHER D. KARLS xxx-xx-x
 SHIRLEY F. KARPEN xxx-xx-x
 DONALD C. KAYLER, III xxx-xx-x
 DONALD G. KAYNOR xxx-xx-x
 PATRICK M. KEEPPE xxx-xx-x
 LISA C. KEELING xxx-xx-x
 FRANK J. KEHL, JR xxx-xx-x
 SHAUN T. KELLEHER xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM G. KELLEY xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD C. KELLOGG xxx-xx-x
 SANDRA D. KELLY xxx-xx-x
 DAR K. KEMP, JR xxx-xx-x
 BRYAN D. KENNEDY xxx-xx-x
 DAVID J. KENNEDY xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD R. KENNELLY xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT J. KEOHANE xxx-xx-x
 JOHN K. KEPKO xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS W. KERNS xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY A. KESTER xxx-xx-x
 RICKY A. KIIDER xxx-xx-x
 JAMES W. KIM xxx-xx-x
 KEITH A. KIMMERLE xxx-xx-x
 BRIAN W. KING xxx-xx-x
 COREY D. KING xxx-xx-x
 GLENN J. KING xxx-xx-x
 TIMOTHY R. KING xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM T. KINSLEY xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS E. KITTLER xxx-xx-x
 DAVID V. KLASEK xxx-xx-x
 EUGENE V. KLEISER, JR xxx-xx-x
 TORSTEN G. KLUGE xxx-xx-x
 DONALD J. KNIESCHKE xxx-xx-x
 DONALD F. KNIGHT xxx-xx-x
 RICKIE A. KNOTT xxx-xx-x
 CURTIS KONG xxx-xx-x
 KEITH B. KONTZ xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT S. KOOSTRA xxx-xx-x
 ALLAN D. KOPACK xxx-xx-x
 KRISTA K. KORTUM xxx-xx-x
 JAMES T. KRAPFCK xxx-xx-x
 PAUL A. KRAUSE xxx-xx-x
 BARBARA E. KRIZ xxx-xx-x
 LARRY R. KROECKER xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT L. KROFT xxx-xx-x
 JOHN M. KROMBERG xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL D. KRUSE xxx-xx-x
 JAMES C. KUEHN xxx-xx-x
 JOSEPH F. KUHLMANN, III xxx-xx-x
 KEVIN R. KUHLMANN xxx-xx-x
 MARK M. KUHN xxx-xx-x
 ANDREW D. KULLBERG xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL M. KUNCE xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD KUNDRAT, JR xxx-xx-x
 RUSSELL A. KUTZMAN xxx-xx-x
 PATRICK S. LACLAIR xxx-xx-x
 ROYE R. LACOUR xxx-xx-x
 RAYMOND D. LACOURSE xxx-xx-x
 CURTIS M. LADICH xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. LAIRD xxx-xx-x
 KAREN A. S. LAMARCHE xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY S. LAMB xxx-xx-x
 JAMES P. LAMB xxx-xx-x
 MARK S. LANDESS xxx-xx-x
 DAVID L. LANE xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM H. LANE, III xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY T. LANG xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH W. LANGFORD xxx-xx-x
 ELIOT LANGSAM xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. LANKFORD xxx-xx-x
 JOSEPH A. LAPERRIERE xxx-xx-x
 TIMOTHY J. LAPSYS xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS P. LARKIN xxx-xx-x
 JOHN W. LARRISON xxx-xx-x
 WARD P. LARSEN xxx-xx-x
 LINCOLN E. LARSON xxx-xx-x
 DALE R. LASHER xxx-xx-x
 BRIAN C. LAVELLE xxx-xx-x
 STEVEN J. LAVERTY xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS O. LAWLER xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD F. LAWTON xxx-xx-x
 ANN E. LEBAHN xxx-xx-x

ROBERT R. LECORCHICK xxx-xx-x
 DAVID H. LEGG xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY ROBERT LEIMER xxx-xx-xx
 ROBERT P. LEMIEUX xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM RUSSELL LENNON xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH J. LENTINI xxx-xx-xx
 FRANK A. LEUTE, IV xxx-xx-x
 DEBRA J. LEVIN xxx-xx-x
 PERRY A. LEWIS xxx-xx-x
 REBECCA L. LEWIS xxx-xx-x
 STEVEN J. LIMATTA xxx-xx-xx
 MARK S. LILLEY xxx-xx-x
 KEITH A. LINDSAY xxx-xx-x
 JOHN H. LIPPS xxx-xx-x
 MARK J. LITTLE xxx-xx-x
 KEVIN L. LITTLEJOHN xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL D. LLOYD xxx-xx-x
 ALAN W. LOCKWOOD xxx-xx-x
 ANNETTE L. LODI xxx-xx-x
 LARRY W. LOGSDON xxx-xx-x
 JOHN R. LOHR xxx-xx-x
 JEFFERY B. LOKEN xxx-xx-xx
 TIMOTHY L. LONG xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. LOOSBROCK xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS A. LOUGHRY xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL S. LOVERUDE xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY K. LOWE xxx-xx-x
 RAY D. LOWE xxx-xx-x
 DONALD L. LOWRY xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL GORDON LUCAS xxx-xx-x
 CHRISTOPHER J. LUCEY xxx-xx-x
 JAMES A. LUDDEN xxx-xx-x
 STEPHEN F. LUKACS xxx-xx-x
 RAYMOND J. LYNOTT xxx-xx-x
 PAUL D. MACARTHUR xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT F. MACCORTON xxx-xx-x
 KEVIN D. MACGINNIS xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL A. MACWILLIAM xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY B. MADSEN xxx-xx-x
 PAUL M. MADSEN xxx-xx-x
 KEVIN W. MAHAFFEY xxx-xx-x
 FRANKLIN J. MALAFARIN, JR. xxx-xx-xx
 RICHARD MALAGRIFA xxx-xx-x
 JAMES F. MALLARD xxx-xx-x
 RAY A. MANDERY xxx-xx-x
 TIMOTHY T. MANGELS xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS J. MANLEY, III xxx-xx-x
 TIMOTHY A. MANNING xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM M. MANTIPLY xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. MARCHAND xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL B. MARINO xxx-xx-x
 GENEROSO D. MARQUEZ xxx-xx-x
 JAMES D. MARSH, JR. xxx-xx-xx
 PHILLIP B. MARSHALL xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS S. MARSHALL, JR. xxx-xx-x
 GLENN D. MARTIN xxx-xx-x
 WALTER J. MARTIN xxx-xx-x
 RAFAEL MARTINEZ xxx-xx-x
 DAVID R. MARTZ xxx-xx-x
 DEAN B. MARVIN xxx-xx-x
 WALTER L. MARVIN xxx-xx-x
 GARY E. MARX xxx-xx-x
 RANDALL L. MARZEN xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY A. MASON xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL G. MASON xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT L. MASON, JR. xxx-xx-x
 STEVE J. MATACIA xxx-xx-x
 JOHN R. MATHEWS xxx-xx-x
 SCOTT R. MATTHEWS xxx-xx-x
 ROY A. MATTHEWS, JR. xxx-xx-x
 DONALD F. MATTNER, JR. xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS M. MATYSKIELA xxx-xx-x
 JOHN J. MAURACH xxx-xx-x
 JOHN R. MAUER xxx-xx-x
 CRAIG M. MAY xxx-xx-x
 JOHN R. MAYER xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT M. MAZEL xxx-xx-x
 RUSSELL E. MCCALLIEB xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY M. MCCANN xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH R. MCCAULEY xxx-xx-x
 DAVID K. MCCOMBS xxx-xx-x
 TIMOTHY D. MCCOOL xxx-xx-x
 JAMES D. MCCULLOUGH xxx-xx-x
 KEN R. MCDANIEL xxx-xx-x
 MARK C. MCDONALD xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY J. MCDOWELL xxx-xx-x
 PATSY J. MCFADDEN xxx-xx-x
 MARK A. MCGINLEY xxx-xx-x
 MARK T. MCKENZIE xxx-xx-x
 ERIC J. MCKINLEY xxx-xx-x
 JAMES E. MCKOY xxx-xx-x
 TIMOTHY D. MCMANON xxx-xx-x
 RONALD G. MCMANUS, JR. xxx-xx-x
 DAVID M. MCMINN xxx-xx-x
 JOHN E. MCNEIL xxx-xx-x
 TIMOTHY M. MCNEIL xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES E. MCQUEEN, JR. xxx-xx-x
 WILSON G. MCWHIRTER, III xxx-xx-x
 NEIL R. MCWHORTER xxx-xx-x
 SHARYN N. MCWHORTER xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY W. MELAND xxx-xx-x
 JOEL C. MELBY xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT J. MELCHIONDA xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT E. MELTON, JR. xxx-xx-x
 ALBERT R. MERCER xxx-xx-x
 JOHN T. MERKLEIN xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD A. MEYER xxx-xx-x
 DEAN MICHALS xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES B. MIDDLETON xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. MIGLIORANZI xxx-xx-x
 KEVIN J. MIHELIC xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH J. MILLARD xxx-xx-x

HUGH A. MILLER xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY C. MILLER xxx-xx-xx
 MARK T. MILLER xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD G. MILLER xxx-xx-x
 STEPHEN C. MILLER xxx-xx-x
 STEVEN D. MILLER xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM E. MILLER xxx-xx-x
 DAVID R. MILLETTE xxx-xx-x
 DAVID B. MILNER, JR. xxx-xx-x
 CRAIG L. MINOR xxx-xx-x
 DAVID J. MITCHELL xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL C. MITCHELL xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM L. MITCHELL xxx-xx-x
 ANDREW J. MITSCH xxx-xx-x
 RONALD G. MONSOUR xxx-xx-x
 GERARD A. MONTANI xxx-xx-x
 BENJAMIN F. MOORE, JR. xxx-xx-x
 DENNIS D. MOORE xxx-xx-x
 GORDON L. MOORE xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH W. MOORE xxx-xx-x
 MICHELLE D. MOORE xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM A. MOORE xxx-xx-x
 DOUGLAS C. MOOSE xxx-xx-x
 MARK P. MOOSHIAN xxx-xx-x
 JOHN R. MOOTZ xxx-xx-x
 LATANJA M. MORAGNE xxx-xx-x
 JAMES R. MORAN xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT A. MORECRAFT xxx-xx-x
 STEPHEN J. MORES xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD B. MORRIS xxx-xx-x
 KEVIN C. MORRIS xxx-xx-x
 MARCUS A. MORRIS xxx-xx-x
 STEVEN R. MORTENSEN xxx-xx-x
 MELINDA S. MORTON xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM A. MOSS xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES F. MOWERY, III xxx-xx-x
 LAWRENCE D. MOZINGO xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD S. MULREADY xxx-xx-x
 DAVID W. MUMBULO xxx-xx-x
 SESHAGIRI MUNIPAL, III xxx-xx-x
 LUIS A. MUNIZ xxx-xx-x
 TERRELL M. MUNSON xxx-xx-x
 LAURENCE B. MUNZ xxx-xx-x
 AUDIE R. MURPHY xxx-xx-x
 BRIAN E. MURPHY xxx-xx-x
 MARTIN E. MUSCHEID xxx-xx-x
 MARTIN C. MUSGRAVE xxx-xx-x
 JOHN R. NACHTMAN xxx-xx-x
 HARVEY A. NAVAS xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS D. NEFF xxx-xx-x
 DAVID R. NELSON xxx-xx-x
 PAUL F. NELSON xxx-xx-x
 TIMOTHY L. NELSON xxx-xx-x
 PAUL T. NEMEC xxx-xx-x
 VINCENT P. NEVILLE xxx-xx-x
 JAMES W. NEWBY xxx-xx-x
 KEITH A. NEWELL xxx-xx-x
 MATTHEW P. NEWMAN xxx-xx-x
 ROGER B. NEWTON xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY W. NICKS xxx-xx-x
 JAMES E. NIKODEM xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD A. NIXDORF xxx-xx-x
 ROGER W. NOBLE xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL A. NOLAN xxx-xx-x
 WESLEY L. NOLDEN, II xxx-xx-x
 RONALD A. NOLDER xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS M. NOLTA xxx-xx-x
 DAVID W. NOLTE xxx-xx-x
 SUZANNE M. NORMANDI xxx-xx-x
 BOYD T. NORRIS xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT J. NORRIS, III xxx-xx-xx
 MICHAEL D. NUSIS xxx-xx-x
 JOHN W. OBERLIN xxx-xx-x
 FRANK A. OCHELLI xxx-xx-x
 JAMES S. OCONNELL xxx-xx-x
 PATRICK J. OCONNELL xxx-xx-x
 LUISA G. OGLIVIE xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. OKEEFE xxx-xx-x
 DAVID A. OLEARY xxx-xx-x
 PARRISH A. OLMSTEAD xxx-xx-x
 MARTIN H. OLSON, II xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS ONEILL xxx-xx-x
 JAMES C. ONUSKO xxx-xx-x
 WALTER D. ORD xxx-xx-x
 NELSON R. ORTIZ xxx-xx-x
 PETER L. OSTERHUS xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES C. OSTROM xxx-xx-x
 KEVIN C. OSTRYE xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY L. OWEN xxx-xx-x
 YVES L. PACHECO xxx-xx-x
 DAVID P. PAHOS xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD H. PAINTER xxx-xx-x
 CHRISTOPHER J. PALERMO xxx-xx-xx
 THOMAS J. PALMER xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM J. PALMER xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT L. PARADIS xxx-xx-x
 DAVID C. PARKINSON xxx-xx-x
 RODNEY R. PARKINSON xxx-xx-x
 PATRICK PARNELL xxx-xx-x
 NORMAN H. PATNODE xxx-xx-x
 SEAN M. PATRICK xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM C. PATRICK xxx-xx-x
 GERALD M. PAULUS xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD W. PAYNE, II xxx-xx-x
 STEVEN T. PAYNE xxx-xx-x
 MARCO J. PAZ xxx-xx-x
 BRUCE C. PEARSON xxx-xx-x
 LEROY H. PEDONE xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS A. PELCZYNSKI xxx-xx-x
 IRA W. PENCE, III xxx-xx-x
 RODNEY B. PENDEGRASS, JR. xxx-xx-xx
 ERIC L. PENNELL xxx-xx-x

HAROLD S. PERDUE xxx-xx-x
 GORDON G. PEREDO xxx-xx-x
 LUIS E. PEREZ xxx-xx-x
 MARK C. PERNU xxx-xx-x
 FRANK P. PERRINO xxx-xx-x
 PHILIP P. PESICKA xxx-xx-xx
 CHARLES E. PETERSON xxx-xx-x
 DOUGLAS K. PETERSON, JR. xxx-xx-x
 JON A. PETERSON xxx-xx-x
 SCOTT T. PETERSON xxx-xx-x
 GWENETH M. PETRIE xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL S. PETROV xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH D. PHILIPPARTI xxx-xx-xx
 DANIEL A. PHILLIPS xxx-xx-x
 JONATHAN S. PHILLIPS xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM D. PHILLIPS xxx-xx-x
 RONALD H. PICKETT xxx-xx-x
 JOHN D. PICKLE xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. PILLION xxx-xx-x
 DANILO M. PIMENTEL xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL G. PINGINCE xxx-xx-x
 PHILIP L. PINE xxx-xx-xx
 THOMAS W. PITTMAN xxx-xx-x
 KERRY D. POOLE xxx-xx-x
 PETER POON xxx-xx-x
 GARY M. POORE xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL V. PORCO xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD G. POUNTAIN xxx-xx-x
 CARROLL B. POWELL, JR. xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY S. POWELL xxx-xx-x
 JAMES C. POWELL xxx-xx-x
 ANTHONY CATO PRATTI xxx-xx-xx
 STEVEN W. PRATTI xxx-xx-x
 DOUGLAS A. PREIDIS xxx-xx-x
 HUGH O. PRICE, JR. xxx-xx-x
 CURTIS C. PRICER xxx-xx-x
 DOUGLAS C. PRIESKORN xxx-xx-x
 THERESE M. PRITCHARD xxx-xx-x
 DAVID E. PRITTS xxx-xx-x
 MARK A. PRUETT xxx-xx-x
 MARK L. PUGNALE xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT M. PUHALA xxx-xx-x
 BRIAN M. PULLEN xxx-xx-x
 PAUL F. PULSE, III xxx-xx-xx
 DONALD C. PURVIS xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. PUSHCAR xxx-xx-x
 DOUGLAS R. PUTNEY xxx-xx-x
 JAY W. PYLES xxx-xx-x
 DARRELL A. QUICK xxx-xx-x
 STEPHEN H. QUINN xxx-xx-x
 TIMOTHY J. QUINN xxx-xx-x
 DAVID E. RAAB xxx-xx-x
 JOYCE E. RACICOT xxx-xx-x
 JOSEPH P. RACZ xxx-xx-x
 LEWIS H. RADER xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL A. RADFORD xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES M. RAMAGE xxx-xx-x
 HECTOR F. RAMIREZ xxx-xx-x
 SAMUEL H. RAMSAY, III xxx-xx-x
 DAVID W. RAPP xxx-xx-x
 DAVID V. RATHS xxx-xx-x
 BRADLEY D. RAYNAUD xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM L. READ, II xxx-xx-x
 CHRISTOPHER A. REAMS xxx-xx-x
 ANDREW M. REDMOND xxx-xx-x
 ROGER D. REEDY xxx-xx-x
 JOHN R. RESE xxx-xx-x
 BENJAMIN T. REEVES xxx-xx-x
 MITCHELL D. REEVES xxx-xx-x
 CALVIN E. REID, JR. xxx-xx-x
 ALBERT M. REIF xxx-xx-x
 DEREK E. REINHARDT xxx-xx-xx
 ERIC R. REINHARDT xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM W. REINHOLD xxx-xx-x
 DOUGLAS A. RENO xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL B. RESLIS xxx-xx-x
 LUIS M. REYES xxx-xx-x
 DAVID K. REYNOLDS xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL A. REZENDES xxx-xx-x
 LARRY D. RHODES xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH D. RIBLEE xxx-xx-x
 JOSEPH N. RICH xxx-xx-x
 JOE A. RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x
 KIM M. RIGLING xxx-xx-x
 JUSTO L. RIVERA xxx-xx-x
 WESLEY M. ROBBINS xxx-xx-x
 MARVELL ROBERSON xxx-xx-x
 LARRY J. ROBERTS xxx-xx-x
 BRUCE M. ROBERTSON xxx-xx-x
 DANNY P. ROBERTSON xxx-xx-x
 EUGENE A. ROBINETT xxx-xx-x
 BRICE E. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x
 JOSEPH H. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x
 JAMES M. ROBISON xxx-xx-x
 TODD W. ROBISON xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL A. ROCKELL xxx-xx-x
 DARRYL E. ROGERS xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM K. ROGERS xxx-xx-x
 JAIME ROJO xxx-xx-x
 GREGORY J. ROMAIN xxx-xx-x
 ERIC F. ROMAN xxx-xx-x
 TROY B. ROMANS xxx-xx-x
 BRUCE A. ROMEO xxx-xx-x
 PETER E. ROONEY, JR. xxx-xx-x
 FRANK ROSE, III xxx-xx-x
 SUZANNE M. ROSEBERRY xxx-xx-x
 DALE E. ROSENBERG xxx-xx-x
 THEODORE K. ROTHSCHILD xxx-xx-x
 SCOTT E. ROUNDS xxx-xx-x
 KEITH ROUNTREE xxx-xx-x
 LOUIS P. ROWE, JR. xxx-xx-x

CHRISTOPHER B. ROYCRAFT xxx-xx-x...
 JEFFREY P. RUARK xxx-xx-xx...
 BRUCE R. RUNK xxx-xx-x...
 JOEL C. RUSH xxx-xx-x...
 BARRY D. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x...
 KATHERINE J. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x...
 MARK A. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x...
 SCOTT P. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM B. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES H. RYAN xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID REIMER RYAN xxx-xx-x...
 SAMUEL J. SABLAN xxx-xx-x...
 BRAD L. SABO xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT S. SAEVZ xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL A. SALVI xxx-xx-x...
 WALTER J. SAMS xxx-xx-x...
 PATRICIA A. SARGENT xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES A. SASSER, II xxx-xx-xx...
 ALAN G. SATTLER xxx-xx-x...
 EDWIN M. SAUER xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL E. SCHAAM xxx-xx-x...
 STEVEN F. SCHAEFER xxx-xx-x...
 KEVIN M. SCHAFER xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS J. SCHAUB xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT W. SCHELTZ xxx-xx-x...
 SCOTT J. SCHERBENSKY xxx-xx-x...
 KATHLEEN M. SCHETTER xxx-xx-x...
 PAUL D. SCHIRMER xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN H. SCHMIDT xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT C. SCHNEIDER xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT P. SCHOTT xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES SCHULTZ, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL A. SCHWAMM xxx-xx-x...
 GARY T. SCOTT xxx-xx-x...
 JED L. SCOTT xxx-xx-x...
 LYNN R. SCOTT xxx-xx-x...
 RONNIE L. SEELY xxx-xx-x...
 KATHERINE SELLA xxx-xx-x...
 PHILIP M. SENNA xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID M. SERLEY xxx-xx-x...
 ERIC J. SETTERGREN xxx-xx-x...
 JOSEPH M. SEUFZEL xxx-xx-x...
 DANNY J. SHAFER xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES L. SHAVER xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT S. SHAW, II xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM A. SHAW, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 FORREST K. SHEALY xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM L. SHERMAN xxx-xx-x...
 BRIAN D. SHIMEL xxx-xx-x...
 JANGRUMETTA D. SHINE xxx-xx-x...
 BRIAN R. SHIPMAN xxx-xx-x...
 ANDRE L. SHIPH xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL K. SHORTT xxx-xx-x...
 STANLEY J. SHUBA xxx-xx-x...
 ELLIE GIVAN SHULER, III xxx-xx-x...
 BRYAN J. SHUMOCK xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN C. SHUTTLE xxx-xx-x...
 STEPHEN D. SICKLE xxx-xx-x...
 MARK A. SIGLEY xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT A. SILVERSTEIN xxx-xx-x...
 DARRIN SIMMONDS xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID E. SIMMONS xxx-xx-x...
 MARK A. SIMON xxx-xx-x...
 RONALD L. SIMPSON xxx-xx-x...
 DANNY L. SIMS xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM F. SIMS xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN B. SINCERBAUM xxx-xx-x...
 LARHONDA S. SINGLETON xxx-xx-x...
 MANUEL E. SISO, IV xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT K. SITTLOH xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL A. W. SIZOO xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT T. SLATER, JR. xxx-xx-xx...
 KEVIN SLUSS xxx-xx-x...
 LISA J. SMAR xxx-xx-x...
 ARTHUR C. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID T. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 ERIC H. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 GREGORY S. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 HILTON SMITH, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 KENNETH L. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 KEVIN C. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 LUTTRELL A. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 MARK A. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 NEAL C. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 ROGER L. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS R. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 TODD R. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
 RAE C. SMOLEN xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM D. SMOLINSKI xxx-xx-x...
 JOSEPH C. SNOW xxx-xx-x...
 NEVILLE W. SONNER xxx-xx-x...
 GEORGE F. SOODOO xxx-xx-x...
 MARK G. SOPKO xxx-xx-x...
 STEVEN W. SORENSEN xxx-xx-x...
 DOUGLAS J. SORNA xxx-xx-x...
 MARKUS S. SORRELLS xxx-xx-x...
 RICARDO J. SOTO xxx-xx-x...
 SIMMONS S. SPAIN, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL L. SPEER xxx-xx-x...
 GARY K. SPENCER, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD H. SPENCER xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES J. SPITZNAGER xxx-xx-x...
 ANTHONY SPRADLEY xxx-xx-x...
 ROGER A. SPRENGER xxx-xx-x...
 JIM M. STALEY xxx-xx-x...
 DOUGLAS H. STANDIFER xxx-xx-x...
 ROSSER B. STANDIFER xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT M. STANGER xxx-xx-x...
 GARY M. STANISLAWSKI xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD B. STARK xxx-xx-x...
 ARNOLD W. STARK, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD J. STECKBECK xxx-xx-x...

WILLIAM V. STEERS xxx-xx-x...
 SHANE T. STEGMAN xxx-xx-x...
 JEFFREY A. STEINHILBER xxx-xx-xx...
 DEAN R. STENGL xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID F. STEWART xxx-xx-x...
 RANDON C. STEWART xxx-xx-x...
 TERRY E. STINE xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID L. STJOHN xxx-xx-x...
 PHILIP L. STOLL xxx-xx-x...
 ERIC J. STONE xxx-xx-x...
 JACK E. STONE xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD D. STORR xxx-xx-x...
 JOE M. STOVALL xxx-xx-x...
 STEPHEN N. STRIGER xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT A. STROUD, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 TIMOTHY N. STRUNK xxx-xx-x...
 CHRISTOPHER A. SUGHER xxx-xx-x...
 KEITH E. SULLIVAN xxx-xx-x...
 SHANNON M. SULLIVAN xxx-xx-x...
 BRUCE K. SUMMERS xxx-xx-x...
 JOSEPH C. SUSSINGHAM xxx-xx-x...
 DALE J. SVEJ xxx-xx-x...
 ANDREW D. SWANSON xxx-xx-x...
 MATTHEW D. SWANSON xxx-xx-x...
 STEPHEN J. SWANTON xxx-xx-x...
 DANIEL J. SWEENEY xxx-xx-x...
 DARRYL L. SWEETWINE xxx-xx-x...
 WAYNE H. SWIERS xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID V. SWINNEY xxx-xx-x...
 JEFFREY B. SYMMES xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES J. SZCZUR xxx-xx-x...
 STEVEN W. TANK xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID J. TANTHORBIE xxx-xx-x...
 GREGORY W. TAPAY xxx-xx-x...
 MARK A. TARNOW xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM W. TARVIN xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES D. TAYLOR xxx-xx-x...
 TONY L. TAYLOR xxx-xx-x...
 TIMOTHY N. TEETS xxx-xx-x...
 RONALD E. TEMPEST, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 J.D.S. TEW, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL A. THEURICH xxx-xx-x...
 ANTHONY C. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
 DANIEL THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
 GREGORY L. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
 TERRENCE C. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
 LUCIAN S. THOMASON, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES K. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x...
 JUSTINE E. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES D. THORNE xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL L. THORNE xxx-xx-x...
 RANDY P. THREEE xxx-xx-x...
 PAUL W. THURSTON xxx-xx-x...
 RUDOLPH J. TIBURZIO, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 KEVIN D. TILGHMAN xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD W. TILTON xxx-xx-x...
 CHRISTOPHER TIMBERLAKE xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM M. TOBIN xxx-xx-x...
 HOWARD E. TOMLINSON, III xxx-xx-x...
 GARY D. TOPOFER xxx-xx-x...
 GLORIA G. TRABULSI xxx-xx-x...
 IAN D. TRACY xxx-xx-x...
 SIDNEY C. TRAFF xxx-xx-x...
 DENNIS W. TROSEN xxx-xx-x...
 MATTHEW E. TUCKER xxx-xx-x...
 PETER C. TUPTJE xxx-xx-x...
 BRYN K. TURNER xxx-xx-x...
 KAREN E. TURNER xxx-xx-x...
 LUTHER S. TURNER xxx-xx-x...
 TROY A. TURNER xxx-xx-x...
 LAURENCE S. TURNER xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD D. TWIGG xxx-xx-x...
 RANDALL M. ULLMANN xxx-xx-x...
 BRUCE E. ULRICH xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL L. ULSHAFER xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL J. UNDERKOFER xxx-xx-x...
 VINCENT P. UNICE xxx-xx-x...
 LENA S. UNVERRICH xxx-xx-x...
 RALPH E. URCH xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN C. VALLE xxx-xx-x...
 SCOTT C. VANLAROUUM xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES G. VANDERNECK xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN H. VANDERVALK xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN VANDERWEEL xxx-xx-x...
 MATTHEW A. VANWINKLE, III xxx-xx-x...
 MARK E. VANZANDT xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES R. VASATKA xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN A. VASKOVICH xxx-xx-x...
 TIMOTHY R. VAUGHAN xxx-xx-x...
 CHRISTOPHER P. VERONIN xxx-xx-x...
 PHILLIP M. VERRERI xxx-xx-x...
 PETER F. VETTERS xxx-xx-x...
 DANIEL C. VICK xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN A. VISE xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT L. VOGTIL xxx-xx-x...
 MARK A. VONBOKERN xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT L. WAGER, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 HOWARD J. WAGNER xxx-xx-x...
 EDWIN P. WAGNON, III xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT S. WAGUESPACK xxx-xx-x...
 SCOTT A. WAID xxx-xx-x...
 MARK T. WALDRON xxx-xx-x...
 KRISTINA A. WALK xxx-xx-x...
 PAMELA ANN WALKER xxx-xx-x...
 KENNETH J. WALL xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS F. WALLACE xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES F. WALLER, II xxx-xx-x...
 BLANE L. WAMPLER xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID L. WAPPNER xxx-xx-x...
 ANTHONY B. WARNER xxx-xx-x...
 CHERRY A. WASHINGTON xxx-xx-x...
 JEFFREY P. WATERBURY xxx-xx-x...

LAWRENCE A. WATERMAN xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES WATTERS, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 HARRY W. WATTS xxx-xx-x...
 DEAN E. WEATHERS xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN B. WEAVER xxx-xx-x...
 VERNON M. WEBER xxx-xx-x...
 CRAIG A. WEISMAN xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL S. WEISS xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL R. WELDON xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL WELLS xxx-xx-x...
 DANIEL A. WEST xxx-xx-x...
 MARK C. WESTON xxx-xx-x...
 DOUGLAS K. WESTPHAL xxx-xx-x...
 CHRISTOPHER N. WHEATLEY xxx-xx-xx...
 ROBERT E. WHEELER xxx-xx-x...
 MARTIN WHELAN xxx-xx-x...
 DENNIS M. WHITE xxx-xx-x...
 LELAND T. WHITE xxx-xx-x...
 PATRICK K. WHITE xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM K. WHITE xxx-xx-x...
 SCOTT G. WHITMORE xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES R. WHITZEL xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES L. WICHLAC xxx-xx-x...
 ROY T. WIERING xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT M. WILKINSON, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 BRIAN N. WILLETT xxx-xx-x...
 BRIAN J. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES KEITH WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
 GREGORY L. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN B. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
 LINDBERG WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
 SCOTT A. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
 STANLEY T. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
 ANDREW S. WILLIAMSON xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS G. WILLIAMSON xxx-xx-x...
 DONALD J. WILLIS xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES A. WILLSON xxx-xx-x...
 DIANE A. WILSON xxx-xx-x...
 FRANCIS D. WILSON, III xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES D. WINKLER xxx-xx-x...
 SUSAN E. WINTON xxx-xx-x...
 FLOYD L. WISEMAN xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID G. WISNEWSKI xxx-xx-x...
 TODD N. WISSING xxx-xx-x...
 CHRISTOPHER P. WITMANN xxx-xx-x...
 PAUL M. WITTSACK xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL T. WOLF xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT W. WOLFE xxx-xx-x...
 GARY S. WOLLAM xxx-xx-x...
 MARY B. WOOD xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID W. WOOD xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN J. WOOD xxx-xx-x...
 JUDE A. WOODHEAD xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID G. WOODS xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID P. WOODS xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN L. WOODS xxx-xx-x...
 ALAN J. WORLEY xxx-xx-x...
 WARING L. WORSHAM, JR. xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN A. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD A. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID J. WYNDHAM xxx-xx-x...
 RODNEY R. YATES xxx-xx-x...
 DAN R. YEAMANS xxx-xx-x...
 EUGENE YIM xxx-xx-x...
 DARRELL G. YOUNG xxx-xx-x...
 JUAN D. YOUNG xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL A. YOUNG xxx-xx-x...
 SCOTT A. YOUNG xxx-xx-x...
 SHANE A. YOUNG xxx-xx-x...
 LORI A. YOUNGS xxx-xx-x...
 STEPHEN M. ZAISEL xxx-xx-x...
 BRIAN G. ZALENAS xxx-xx-x...
 DALE L. ZIMMERMAN xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID A. ZIMMERMAN xxx-xx-x...
 WAYNE A. ZIMMET xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM DUTIES INDICATED WITH GRADE AND DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL THE OFFICERS BE APPOINTED IN A GRADE HIGHER THAN CAPTAIN.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

MICHAEL A. BIEWEND xxx-xx-x...
 DWIGHT R. BRASWELL xxx-xx-x...
 WILFRED R. BRISTOL xxx-xx-x...
 GARY D. BROOKS xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES E. BURNETT xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL C. COGGINS xxx-xx-x...
 DAN S. CRAWFORD xxx-xx-x...
 KEITH A. DARLINGTON xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES N. DAVIDSON xxx-xx-x...
 GEORGE DUNCAN xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL W. DUNCAN xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD B. DUNN xxx-xx-x...
 PHILIP J. FISHER xxx-xx-x...
 JEFFERY S. GALLEN xxx-xx-x...
 AVELINO GARCIA xxx-xx-x...
 PATRICK A. HERRING xxx-xx-x...
 DENNIS K. KITTERMAN xxx-xx-x...
 JERRY D. LEWIS xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID R. MAACK xxx-xx-x...
 ALFRED M. MCGOWEN xxx-xx-x...
 JOSEPH H. MCGUIN xxx-xx-x...
 LAWRENCE J. MCGUIN xxx-xx-x...
 HILARION A. MIKALOFFSKY xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD F. MUNSELL xxx-xx-x...
 JEFFREY L. NEUBERGER xxx-xx-xx...
 LEON D. PAGE, SR. xxx-xx-x...

GARY R. PERRY xxx-xx-x...
ALVIE E. ROBBINS xxx-xx-x...
GLENN D. ROGERS xxx-xx-x...
EUGENE H. SCHINE xxx-xx-x...
GARY L. SMITH xxx-xx-x...

JUDGE ADVOCATE

JAMES A. BLACKWELL, II xxx-xx-x...
NOBERT J. DIAZ xxx-xx-x...
DAVID G. NIX xxx-xx-x...
JO ANN STRINGS xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD J. VACURA xxx-xx-x...

NURSE CORPS

RANDALL A. AKINS xxx-xx-x...
SHARON A. ALLEN xxx-xx-x...
CONNIE R. ANDERSON xxx-xx-x...
CORTLAND J. ARLIEN xxx-xx-x...
DIANE D. BALLWEG xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS G. BARLOGG xxx-xx-x...
RONALD L. BASS xxx-xx-x...
RHONDA D. BAXLER xxx-xx-x...
DEBORAH S. BEATTY xxx-xx-x...
JULIE R. BECCARDI xxx-xx-x...
DIANE L. BECK xxx-xx-x...
JANICE S. BECH xxx-xx-x...
JEAN M. BELL xxx-xx-x...
MARIANNE M. BISHOP xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD L. BLACKSTON xxx-xx-x...
AUDREY M. BOLTON xxx-xx-x...
ANNA M. BOWSER xxx-xx-x...
ELIZABETH C. BRADLEY xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY E. BRENNER xxx-xx-x...
SARA A. BRONSON xxx-xx-x...
ANN K. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
DEIDRE L. BUCHAN xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTINE M. BUCHER xxx-xx-x...
JENNIFER A. BZOWY xxx-xx-x...
ANGELA M. CALDERON xxx-xx-x...
KATHERINE M. CALLIES xxx-xx-x...
BARTON L. CARNOALI xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTINE D. CAWOOL xxx-xx-x...
CECIL J. CLARK, JR. xxx-xx-x...
KATHERINE E. CLARKE xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL CLAYTON xxx-xx-x...
CYNTHIA D. COLES xxx-xx-x...
CHERYL A. COLLICOTT xxx-xx-x...
CARY E. COLLINS xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN B. CONNOR xxx-xx-x...
MAUREEN B. CONROY xxx-xx-x...
ANITA L. COOK xxx-xx-x...
JAMES W. COWELL xxx-xx-x...
PATRICK J. COYNE xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH G. CROUCH xxx-xx-x...
CYNTHIA A. CUE xxx-xx-x...
ANN P. CURTIS xxx-xx-x...
KIMBERLY G. CYRUS xxx-xx-x...
SHERRA M. G. DECOUL xxx-xx-x...
KATHRYN A. DILLOW xxx-xx-x...
KAREN S. DOANE xxx-xx-x...
TERESA A. DUGGAN xxx-xx-x...
KATE H. EASLEY xxx-xx-x...
TERESA L. ETHER xxx-xx-x...
JOYCE A. EVANS xxx-xx-x...
KAREN G. EVERS xxx-xx-x...
PAULA I. FARRIS xxx-xx-x...
WINIFRED L. FLANAGAN xxx-xx-x...
DIANA R. FLORES xxx-xx-x...
LYNNE A. FOSS xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN M. FRIESE xxx-xx-x...
ROY H. FUKUOKA xxx-xx-x...
LINDA S. GARRETTSON xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT L. GASTON xxx-xx-x...
BONNIE L. GORDON xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES A. HAGNER xxx-xx-x...
SHARON L. HALE xxx-xx-x...
CATHY J. HANLEY xxx-xx-x...
MARY B. HARRISON xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD F. HEFNER xxx-xx-x...
DONNA M. HEITER xxx-xx-x...
EVELYN C. HENRY xxx-xx-x...
JANET C. HOBAN xxx-xx-x...
CHERIE R. HOLLAND xxx-xx-x...
PAMELA A. HOLLSTEN xxx-xx-x...
JAMES P. HOLT xxx-xx-x...
KATHRYN B. HOVERSTEN xxx-xx-x...
DANA S. HOWARD xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS C. HOWARD, JR. xxx-xx-x...
MONICA L. HUCKINS xxx-xx-x...
BARBARA HUDAK xxx-xx-x...
PAULA J. HUDSONGOODMAN xxx-xx-x...
ELAINE M. IGNOTS xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN L. IRONS xxx-xx-x...
MARCELLINE A. JAMES xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS J. JENKINS xxx-xx-x...
KAREN A. JONES xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP W. JULIA xxx-xx-x...
DAWN T. KEMP xxx-xx-x...
DIANA L. KIENLE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN D. KNUDSON xxx-xx-x...
KATHLEEN A. KOUSS xxx-xx-x...
DIANA J. LANSING xxx-xx-x...
DIANE M. LAWLOR xxx-xx-x...
ROSE A. LAYMAN xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD LEDESMA xxx-xx-x...
CYNTHIA L. LEHTO xxx-xx-x...
JAMES R. LORRAIN xxx-xx-x...

LORI A. MACIAS xxx-xx-x...
VERONICA MASSETT xxx-xx-x...
EUGENE A. MCADOO xxx-xx-x...
SUZANNE P. MCCAMBER xxx-xx-x...
DAWN A. MCCORMICK xxx-xx-x...
LAURIE J. MCMULLIN xxx-xx-x...
MARGARET M. MCNEILL xxx-xx-x...
JEFFERY W. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
PAUL T. MORDINI xxx-xx-x...
CARYL J. MOULDER xxx-xx-x...
VICKI M. MURPHY xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES E. MUSSLEWHITE xxx-xx-x...
ANNELIE C. NISSEN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID NORMAN xxx-xx-x...
SHERRY K. OBERDIER xxx-xx-x...
ROSALINDA C. OLIVER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN G. PALM xxx-xx-x...
VALERIE S. PARKER xxx-xx-x...
KAREN L. PAYNE xxx-xx-x...
MARY K. O. PERRY xxx-xx-x...
JANET V. PHELPS xxx-xx-x...
DINAH L. PINNEY xxx-xx-x...
ANN K. POLHLOPEN xxx-xx-x...
DEBORAH C. QUINN xxx-xx-x...
CLARENCE E. QUINN xxx-xx-x...
PAULA J. RALSTON xxx-xx-x...
CYNTHIA K. RAUSOBOTKA xxx-xx-x...
SHERRY R. RAWLSBRYCE xxx-xx-x...
FRANCES L. REED xxx-xx-x...
DEBORAH A. REES xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD E. REEVES, II xxx-xx-x...
JENNIFER D. REINHARDT xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT S. RICHARDS xxx-xx-x...
MARK L. RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x...
ROSANNE E. RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT O. RIGDON xxx-xx-x...
DIANE C. ROBERTSON xxx-xx-x...
KATHRYN L. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x...
SHEILA C. ROGERS xxx-xx-x...
KENT D. ROYER xxx-xx-x...
JIMMIE JACKSON RYALS, JR. xxx-xx-x...
MICHELLE A. RYERSON xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPHINE F. SCHANTZ xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. SELLI xxx-xx-x...
JANET S. SELMAN xxx-xx-x...
SANDRA J. SINAY xxx-xx-x...
LAURA B. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
MEGHAN R. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT R. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
JANET L. SOMLIYA xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN W. STAGNER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. STARZYK xxx-xx-x...
LOIS J. STAUFFER xxx-xx-x...
JAYNE E. STETTY xxx-xx-x...
CYNTHIA L. STILLER xxx-xx-x...
ORSBURN STONE xxx-xx-x...
DOREEN R. STREIBER xxx-xx-x...
PENNY K. STURGEON xxx-xx-x...
ELLEN L. SUDBERRY xxx-xx-x...
WALTEA J. SWABEY xxx-xx-x...
KEITH E. TACKETT xxx-xx-x...
JANET T. TAYLOR xxx-xx-x...
MICHELE S. TERNER xxx-xx-x...
CONNIE D. TERRY xxx-xx-x...
PATRICIA F. THON xxx-xx-x...
JANET L. TILLIE xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW D. VANSICKEL xxx-xx-x...
ANGELA C. VICKERS xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY A. VINCENTI xxx-xx-x...
JANICE A. WHITE xxx-xx-x...
LORI D. WIITA xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH A. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
SALLY A. WILLIS xxx-xx-x...
PATRICIA S. WOODWARD xxx-xx-x...
LAURIE A. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x...
BETH J. WUNSCH xxx-xx-x...
CATHERINE M. YOUNKER xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

GERT M. BAILLES xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL W. BAUER xxx-xx-x...
REGINA A. BLANKE xxx-xx-x...
RUSSELL L. CARTER xxx-xx-x...
THEODORE P. CHIAPPELLI xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN B. CONSTANTINE xxx-xx-x...
NOREEN G. DAUGHTRY xxx-xx-x...
LINDA D. DENT xxx-xx-x...
KERRY M. DEXTER xxx-xx-x...
HARRY L. EDWARDS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. FLEURQUIN xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH L. FRANKLIN xxx-xx-x...
FIDEL E. GUILLERMETI xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS M. HARKENRIDER xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL R. HARRISON xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND I. HEIMBUCK, II xxx-xx-x...
KENT R. HELWIG xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN R. HURLEY xxx-xx-x...
DEBRA R. IRWIN xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH C. JACOBS xxx-xx-x...
ROGER A. KALONICK xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY S. KIDDI xxx-xx-x...
ROBIN E. LAKE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN A. LAROSE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT C. LENAHAN xxx-xx-x...
DANIAL P. LEWIS xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS G. MCCAMMILL xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY R. MCGEE xxx-xx-x...
CYNTHIA L. MCLELLAN xxx-xx-x...
JAMES P. MORGAN xxx-xx-x...
MARK D. MULLEN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL K. OCONNOR xxx-xx-x...
CURTIS G. PEDERSON xxx-xx-x...

STANLEY M. POLSON xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES E. POTTEN xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT E. PURDY xxx-xx-x...
PETER R. RAMSARON xxx-xx-x...
TERESA L. SIROIS xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL F. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
SANDRA J. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL H. SPILL xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN J. STEIN xxx-xx-x...
CAROL L. STONE xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM J. TROUH xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE M. URICK xxx-xx-x...
JAMES M. WHITE xxx-xx-x...
DONNIE R. WIDEMAN xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN K. WITTT xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS E. YINGST xxx-xx-x...
M. JEANNE YODER xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. YOUNG xxx-xx-x...

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

KAREN M. BACHMANN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID E. BELLVILIL xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT F. BERKHEIMER xxx-xx-x...
REX A. BLUNCK xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT V. BOWBESOM xxx-xx-x...
RUSSELL S. BOYD xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN M. BOYLE xxx-xx-x...
PATRICK O. BRADSHAW xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE A. R. BRASWELL xxx-xx-x...
JONATHAN W. BRIGGS xxx-xx-x...
OKEEFE MARY E. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
JAYNE M. BRUEGGEN xxx-xx-x...
MICHEL L. BUNNING xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE R. BURNHAM xxx-xx-x...
MARK A. BYRD xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY J. BYRNE xxx-xx-x...
JAMES J. CLARKE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT F. CLINKSCALP xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM G. COURTNEY xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS B. CROSS xxx-xx-x...
RODNEY L. CROWLEY xxx-xx-x...
MARILYN E. DAVIDTOPPERMAN xxx-xx-x...
PAUL F. DAVIS xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN R. DEANDA xxx-xx-x...
RAFAEL A. DIAZ xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT H. DOE xxx-xx-x...
TERESA L. DOWDER xxx-xx-x...
DAVID R. DOWNY xxx-xx-x...
DAVID G. DUNLOP xxx-xx-x...
BRADFORD R. DUNN xxx-xx-x...
FELIX D. EMOND, JR. xxx-xx-x...
JEROME J. ERSLAND xxx-xx-x...
DALE A. FERGUSON xxx-xx-x...
PATRICIA A. GARCIA xxx-xx-x...
KUL B. GARG xxx-xx-x...
GALEN G. GEARHEART xxx-xx-x...
ROGER L. GIBSON xxx-xx-x...
CLIFTON M. GILMORE xxx-xx-x...
RICARDO GONZALEZ xxx-xx-x...
JOHN K. GRAYSON xxx-xx-x...
RAY A. GREEN xxx-xx-x...
MARK D. GREGORY xxx-xx-x...
LARRY W. GROVES xxx-xx-x...
RANDALL S. HAGAN xxx-xx-x...
JACK A. HAGER xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH E. HALL xxx-xx-x...
KENT K. HALL xxx-xx-x...
JAMES H. HANNAPON, II xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM M. HARLEY, III xxx-xx-x...
SUE E. HARMON xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL M. HEWITT xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN B. HICKS xxx-xx-x...
HAROLD S. HILLMAN xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY P. HOFFMAN xxx-xx-x...
WINIFRED C. HOLCOMBE xxx-xx-x...
MARK S. HOLDEN xxx-xx-x...
MARCIA L. IDDINS xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTINE M. JAGT xxx-xx-x...
DAVID S. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
MARK R. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
PAMELA S. JORDAN xxx-xx-x...
WALTER H. JOYNER xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT N. KANG xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. KROLAK xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. LIZZI xxx-xx-x...
MITCHELL D. LUCY xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT R. MARRS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. MARTIN xxx-xx-x...
FRANK J. MATERESE xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD L. MATTA xxx-xx-x...
DIANE E. MAYES xxx-xx-x...
CANDACE L. MCCALL xxx-xx-x...
PATRICK T. MCMULLEN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID J. MEADE xxx-xx-x...
RAMON M. MEDINA xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. MEINHOLD xxx-xx-x...
CAROLYN L. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL D. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES E. MITCHELL xxx-xx-x...
KARLA A. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN P. MULLIGAN xxx-xx-x...
ROCK A. MUNSEN xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL P. NAUGHTON xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD L. NESBITT xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT M. NICHELSON xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL R. ORME xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS L. PATTI xxx-xx-x...
LEONARD C. PERRY xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN D. QUALLS xxx-xx-x...
PAUL D. RAMSEY xxx-xx-x...
MARIA A. RANDALL xxx-xx-x...

ROBERT J. RENNELL *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT V. ROBEY, JR. *xxx-xx-x...*
 TERRY A. ROICHAUD *xxx-xx-x...*
 JAMES ROCH *xxx-xx-x...*
 CARL R. ROHBOCK *xxx-xx-x...*
 LINDA A. RUCKRIGEL *xxx-xx-x...*
 BRUCE A. RUSCIO *xxx-xx-x...*
 PHIL L. SAMPLES *xxx-xx-x...*
 YVO SANTIAGOGRAYEN *xxx-xx-x...*
 JENNIFER J. SCHIRMER *xxx-xx-x...*
 LISA K. SCHUETTE *xxx-xx-x...*
 THERESA YARBER SCHULTZ *xxx-xx-x...*
 TERRELL E. SCOGGINS *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT M. SHARROW *xxx-xx-x...*
 WILLIAM K. SHELTON *xxx-xx-x...*
 JAMES D. SINGLETERRY *xxx-xx-x...*
 RICHARD P. SKIDMORE *xxx-xx-x...*
 FRANCIS E. SLAVICE *xxx-xx-x...*
 RICHARD M. SPEER *xxx-xx-x...*
 TERRY L. STOTLER *xxx-xx-x...*
 ALLAN D. STOWERS *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOSEPH R. STREMIKIS *xxx-xx-x...*
 MARK S. SWIRCENSKI *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT A. TETLA *xxx-xx-x...*
 DEAN W. THORSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 DONALD R. TOCCO *xxx-xx-x...*
 LILLIAN V. TORRES *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT W. TOWNSLEY *xxx-xx-x...*
 MICHAEL R. TURNER *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT S. VALDEZ *xxx-xx-x...*
 RONALD W. VAUGHN *xxx-xx-x...*
 CATHERINE M. VOGEL *xxx-xx-x...*
 JAMES T. WALKER *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT B. WALTON *xxx-xx-x...*
 THOMAS D. WESTON *xxx-xx-x...*
 EDWARD M. ZASTAWNY *xxx-xx-x...*
 MANFRIED K. ZEITHAMMEL *xxx-xx-x...*

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 593(A) AND 3353:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be colonel

JAMES F. BUTLER, JR. *xxx-xx-xx...*
 JOHNNY F. BUTLER *xxx-xx-x...*
 BERT M. COTTRELL *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT W. DUFFENS *xxx-xx-x...*
 WILLIAM K. GOTTENSMITH *xxx-xx-x...*
 JEROME R. GUTZWILER *xxx-xx-x...*
 JEFFREY J. HOFFMAN *xxx-xx-x...*
 STEVEN B. HOFFMANN *xxx-xx-x...*
 EDWARD W. MCCARTHY III *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOHN R. OSGOOD *xxx-xx-x...*
 DAVID W. TAYLOR *xxx-xx-x...*

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be colonel

GARY G. CLOSE *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT L. HAYES *xxx-xx-x...*

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

ROBERT H. POSTERARO *xxx-xx-x...*

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be colonel

MAX L. OLESON *xxx-xx-x...*
 MICHAEL JR RISKU *xxx-xx-x...*
 ANTON P. TRAMF *xxx-xx-x...*

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be lieutenant colonel

GRATEN D. BEAVERS *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT A. CARDAMONE *xxx-xx-x...*
 JAMES C. CUPEP *xxx-xx-x...*
 PAUL L. DOPPEL *xxx-xx-x...*
 DARRYL J. EGLER *xxx-xx-x...*
 RICHARD C. GOODWIN *xxx-xx-x...*
 MICHAEL S. HIGLEY *xxx-xx-x...*
 AXEL M. HOLLAND *xxx-xx-x...*
 DONALD L. JACKA *xxx-xx-x...*
 ELON W. MADDOX, JR. *xxx-xx-x...*
 BRENT M. MOTCHAN *xxx-xx-x...*
 RONALD J. PARK *xxx-xx-x...*
 LEONARD B. QUINN *xxx-xx-x...*
 RODERICK REYNOLDS *xxx-xx-x...*
 JERRY M. RIVERA *xxx-xx-x...*
 MICHAEL J. ROSS *xxx-xx-x...*
 CHARLES W. RYDER *xxx-xx-x...*
 MICHAEL W. SYMANSKI *xxx-xx-x...*
 BRENDA A. VOSBREIN *xxx-xx-x...*
 KERRY Y. YEN *xxx-xx-x...*
 DAVID T. ZABECKI *xxx-xx-x...*

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

GARY W. COWALL *xxx-xx-x...*

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

RONALD C. MARTIN *xxx-xx-x...*
 ERIC I. MITCHELL *xxx-xx-x...*

ANTHONY E. TRIGENIS *xxx-xx-x...*

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

THOMAS R. KIM, JR. *xxx-xx-x...*

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 593(A) AND 3370:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be colonel

REPPARD S. JORDAN *xxx-xx-x...*
 EUGENE J. KREGER *xxx-xx-x...*

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 593(A) AND 3366:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be lieutenant colonel

BARRY A. BUNCH *xxx-xx-x...*
 THOMAS A. DOLIGHAN *xxx-xx-x...*
 WILLIAM C. HOLFORD *xxx-xx-x...*
 LAURENCE LAPINSKI *xxx-xx-x...*
 ANTHONY F. LEKETA *xxx-xx-x...*
 BOBBY C. NEW *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOHN R. SLATER *xxx-xx-x...*

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

JEROME A. OLACK *xxx-xx-x...*
 ARACELI S. SAMSON *xxx-xx-x...*

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

EUGENE L. KUHN *xxx-xx-x...*

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 593(A), 594(A), AND 3359:

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

ALLAN W. ESTEY *xxx-xx-x...*
 ARVID K. OLSON *xxx-xx-x...*

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 593(A) AND 3365:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be colonel

MICHAEL J. BAYER *xxx-xx-x...*
 RAYMOND E. BECK, SR. *xxx-xx-x...*
 CLEMENT A. HALL, JR. *xxx-xx-x...*
 THOMAS C. JOHNSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 RICHARD B. KAUFMANN *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT G. LITTLE *xxx-xx-x...*
 RALPH D. MARSHALL *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOHN K. MORRIS *xxx-xx-x...*
 SIGURD E. MURPHY *xxx-xx-x...*
 KENNETH R. NELSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 WESTON W. PETERSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 CHARLES R. RAYL *xxx-xx-x...*
 JEAN A. ROMNEY *xxx-xx-x...*
 KENNETH C. SALLER *xxx-xx-x...*
 STEWART E. SMITH *xxx-xx-x...*
 LAWRENCE M. STEWART *xxx-xx-x...*
 DAVID J. TOYE *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOHN W. WYATT *xxx-xx-x...*

To be lieutenant colonel

LOUIS J. ANTONETTI *xxx-xx-x...*
 ALLEN D. BENNETT *xxx-xx-x...*
 THOMAS R. BICKER *xxx-xx-x...*
 JAMES J. BISSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 MICHAEL F. BROWN *xxx-xx-x...*
 TOD J. CARMONY *xxx-xx-x...*
 RAYMOND W. CARTER *xxx-xx-x...*
 CHARLES K. CLARKE *xxx-xx-x...*
 JAMES C. COLEMAN *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT G. CRUZ *xxx-xx-x...*
 JONATHAN E. CZARNICKI *xxx-xx-x...*
 GARY W. DAWSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 AGUSTIN P. DUENAS *xxx-xx-x...*
 MARK N. EDELBROCK *xxx-xx-x...*
 LARRY R. FREAUFF *xxx-xx-x...*
 MICHAEL J. FRIEDL *xxx-xx-x...*
 CHARLES E. GIBSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOSEPH A. GIDDIS, II *xxx-xx-x...*
 RAYMOND P. GOURRE *xxx-xx-x...*
 PAUL E. HARMAN *xxx-xx-x...*
 PAUL M. HOUSE *xxx-xx-x...*
 DONNA L. HUBBERT *xxx-xx-x...*
 WILLIAM A. HUTTON *xxx-xx-x...*
 PAUL E. JENSEN *xxx-xx-x...*
 FORREST R. JOHANSEN, JR. *xxx-xx-x...*
 PAUL A. JOHNSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOHN R. KING *xxx-xx-x...*

LARRY D. KIRCHNER *xxx-xx-x...*

DANIEL S. LEE *xxx-xx-x...*
 RONALD R. LEMOINE *xxx-xx-x...*
 CHARLES B. MCCLOSKEY *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOHN A. MESKILL *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOSEPH E. MICHAELS, JR. *xxx-xx-x...*
 FLOYD E. MILLER *xxx-xx-x...*
 JERRY W. NORTON *xxx-xx-x...*
 DENNIS J. O'BRIEN *xxx-xx-x...*
 LANCE Y. OKIHARA *xxx-xx-x...*
 LARRY L. OLSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 JAMES R. OROURK *xxx-xx-x...*
 CHARLES N. POSEHN *xxx-xx-x...*
 SAMUEL H. RANKIN *xxx-xx-x...*
 ARNOLD G. RETHMEIER *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT I. RODGERS *xxx-xx-x...*
 JEAN M. SHINBUR *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOHN G. STEINHAUSER *xxx-xx-x...*
 FREDERICK STONEHOUSE *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOHN W. VAUGHAN *xxx-xx-x...*
 GENE J. WALKER *xxx-xx-x...*
 SAMUEL A. WILKS *xxx-xx-x...*

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

THOMAS J. HANCOCK *xxx-xx-x...*
 FRANK H. MA *xxx-xx-x...*

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, THE OFFICERS INDICATED BY ASTERISK ARE ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

ARMY

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSE C. ABILES *xxx-xx-x...*
 KERRY S. ABINGTON *xxx-xx-x...*
 JAMES P. ABRAMSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 FREDERIC E. APT *xxx-xx-x...*
 STEVEN R. ACCINCELLI *xxx-xx-x...*
 DENNIS A. ACTON *xxx-xx-x...*
 BENJAMIN M. ADAMS *xxx-xx-x...*
 JONATHAN P. ADAMS *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROY H. ADAMS *xxx-xx-x...*
 RICHARD J. ADAM *xxx-xx-x...*
 GARY R. ADDISON *xxx-xx-x...*
 WILLIAM R. ALDRIDGE *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT S. ALEXANDER *xxx-xx-x...*
 JAMES C. ALLARD *xxx-xx-x...*
 FRED J. ALLEN *xxx-xx-x...*
 JAMES C. ALLEN *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOHNNIE L. ALLEN *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROY J. ALTABELLO *xxx-xx-x...*
 ESTEBAN ALVARADO *xxx-xx-x...*
 MICHAEL W. ALVIS *xxx-xx-x...*
 WILLIAM H. ANDERSEN *xxx-xx-x...*
 DORIAN T. ANDERSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 DOUGLAS C. ANDERSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 DOUGLAS H. ANDERSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 GARY J. ANDERSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 JEFFREY W. ANDERSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT B. ANDERSON *xxx-xx-x...*
 AARON R. ANDREWS *xxx-xx-x...*
 DONALD R. ANDREWS *xxx-xx-x...*
 DAVID M. ANNEN *xxx-xx-x...*
 BERTRAM ARMSTRONG *xxx-xx-x...*
 CLARE H. ARMSTRONG *xxx-xx-x...*
 ODELL ARRINGTON *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOHNNY L. ASBURY *xxx-xx-x...*
 CHARLES ATKINS *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT W. AYLLWARD *xxx-xx-x...*
 WESLEY J. AZAMA *xxx-xx-x...*
 DENISE M. BACHMAN *xxx-xx-x...*
 RUTH B. BAGBY *xxx-xx-x...*
 MARGARET A. *BAHNSEN *xxx-xx-x...*
 MICHAEL J. BAIER *xxx-xx-x...*
 BRUCE B. BAILEY *xxx-xx-x...*
 DONOVAN B. BAILEY *xxx-xx-x...*
 STEPHEN L. BAILEY *xxx-xx-x...*
 THOMAS R. BAILEY *xxx-xx-x...*
 ALLEN S. BAKER *xxx-xx-x...*
 DANIEL F. BAKER *xxx-xx-x...*
 TIMOTHY J. BAKER *xxx-xx-x...*
 JAMES W. BALL *xxx-xx-x...*
 RALPH E. BALL *xxx-xx-x...*
 DAVID A. BALLARD *xxx-xx-x...*
 RICHARD F. BALLALAN *xxx-xx-x...*
 ALLAN A. BANKS *xxx-xx-x...*
 CHARLES W. BARNES *xxx-xx-x...*
 BERNARD A. BARNES *xxx-xx-x...*
 ERIC R. BARNES *xxx-xx-x...*
 KATHLEEN M. BARNES *xxx-xx-x...*
 TED H. BARNES *xxx-xx-x...*
 HAROLD D. BARNETT *xxx-xx-x...*
 DAVID W. BARNO *xxx-xx-x...*
 FREDERICK BARRETT *xxx-xx-x...*
 STEPHEN R. BARTH *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT E. BASSLER *xxx-xx-x...*
 PAUL D. BATES *xxx-xx-x...*
 JESSIE D. BEATH *xxx-xx-x...*
 JOHN M. BECKSTROM *xxx-xx-x...*
 ROBERT J. BEECHER *xxx-xx-x...*
 THOMAS O. BEGASSE *xxx-xx-x...*
 GERALD L. BEHNKE *xxx-xx-x...*
 WILLIAM F. BELL *xxx-xx-x...*
 WILLIAM R. BELL *xxx-xx-x...*

MARK C. BENDER xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH V. BENTON xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN R. BENTON xxx-xx-x...
DAVID J. BERGZEL xxx-xx-x...
DAVID R. BERGER xxx-xx-x...
HOWARD E. BERNHE xxx-xx-x...
VICTOR J. BERO xxx-xx-x...
JAMES W. BERRY xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. BERRY xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE A. BERWICK xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT D. BESANCON xxx-xx-x...
MARSHALL L. BEST xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE C. BETHEI xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL A. BINGHAM xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE M. BIRDSONG xxx-xx-x...
ROY V. BISHOP xxx-xx-x...
MERRILL S. BLACKMAN xxx-xx-x...
JOHN O. BLAKENEY xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS J. BLASKO xxx-xx-x...
GARTH T. BLOXHAM xxx-xx-x...
IVAN G. BOLDEN xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. BONFIMI xxx-xx-x...
CHARLE BONGIOVANNI xxx-xx-x...
LOUIS A. BONHAM xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH C. BONNET xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL J. BONNEY xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY G. BOSSE xxx-xx-x...
ERNEST G. BOTTS xxx-xx-x...
PRINCESS BOULWARE xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS A. BOWERSON xxx-xx-x...
MARK W. BOYER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES W. BOYLE xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP E. BRADFORD xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. BRADLEY xxx-xx-x...
NEAL H. BRALLEY xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH R. BRANCH xxx-xx-x...
ALAN R. BRANDOLINI xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM BRANSFORD xxx-xx-x...
MARC R. BRESLOW xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN E. BREVIC xxx-xx-x...
DALLAS F. BRITTON xxx-xx-x...
LARRY M. BROM xxx-xx-x...
EILEEN M. BROPHY xxx-xx-x...
DAVID BROWN, JR. xxx-xx-x...
JAMES D. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE C. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT R. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT W. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM T. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN A. BROWNING xxx-xx-x...
RANDALL E. BRUCH xxx-xx-x...
KONE BRUGH, II xxx-xx-x...
ALBERT BRYANT, JR. xxx-xx-x...
GARY L. BRYANT xxx-xx-x...
MAURICE BUCHANAN xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN D. BUCKMASTER xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL G. BULINSKI xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS E. BULLAR xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD C. BURMOOD xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. BURNETT xxx-xx-x...
RANDEL B. BURNETT xxx-xx-x...
ALLEN H. BURNS xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT O. BURNS xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHER BURNIS xxx-xx-x...
MANZEL S. BUSH xxx-xx-x...
HOWARD C. BUTLER xxx-xx-x...
REMO BUTLER xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM G. BUTLER xxx-xx-x...
WINFRIED W. BUTLER xxx-xx-x...
DAVID W. BUTO xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES L. BUTTNER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES F. BYRNE xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM B. CALDWELL xxx-xx-x...
PAUL R. CALLANAN xxx-xx-x...
JAMES D. CAMBRON xxx-xx-x...
DAVID W. CAMMONS xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD D. CANTWELL xxx-xx-x...
MARY P. CAPIN xxx-xx-x...
BILL J. CAPPS xxx-xx-x...
FRANK J. CARAVELLA xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT A. CAREY xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS M. CARLIN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID E. CARLSON xxx-xx-x...
WALDO F. CARMONA xxx-xx-x...
STANLEY CARPENTER xxx-xx-x...
LLOYD W. CARR xxx-xx-x...
HECTOR CARRANZA, JR. xxx-xx-x...
ALLAN B. CARROLLI xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES R. CARROLLI xxx-xx-x...
JAMES C. CARTER xxx-xx-x...
ROGER L. CARTER xxx-xx-x...
CARL E. CASE xxx-xx-x...
AVERY T. CASHION xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN L. CASS xxx-xx-x...
RANDAL R. CASTRO xxx-xx-x...
JAMES R. CASWELL xxx-xx-x...
JOHN V. CECALUPO xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN D. CELLUCCI xxx-xx-x...
MARIO A. CERVANTES xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM CHADWICK xxx-xx-x...
DAVID W. CHANDLER xxx-xx-x...
MARTIN A. CHANDLER xxx-xx-x...
RANDALL D. CHASLER xxx-xx-x...
JACK M. CHIAPUZZO xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES D. CHILDERS xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL CHRISTIAN xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM CHRISTIAN xxx-xx-x...
DONALD B. CHUNG xxx-xx-x...
JAMES W. CHURCH xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT C. CLAFLIN xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND G. CLARK xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT L. CLARK xxx-xx-x...

JOHN L. CLARKE xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL R. CLIFFORDE xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE E. CLINE xxx-xx-x...
RANDALL F. COCHRAN xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. COGGIN xxx-xx-x...
LARRY W. COKER xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP D. COKER xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES M. COLBERT xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY H. COLBY xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES G. COLE xxx-xx-x...
EDDIE D. COLEMAN xxx-xx-x...
GARY S. COLEMAN xxx-xx-x...
ERNEST V. COLLIER xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL L. COMBES xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. COMBS xxx-xx-x...
YVONNE J. COMESS xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE W. CONDREY xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE H. CONNER xxx-xx-x...
ROGER L. COOK xxx-xx-x...
JAMES C. COOKE xxx-xx-x...
HAROLD E. COONEY xxx-xx-x...
KING E. COOPER xxx-xx-x...
MARK A. COOPER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. COPE xxx-xx-x...
BLAKE R. COPPLE xxx-xx-x...
VERNON E. CORBIN xxx-xx-x...
DOMINICK CORDASCO xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE G. CORLEY xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY COROALLES xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD A. CORSON xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM C. COUNCIL xxx-xx-x...
EDMUND S. COWAN xxx-xx-x...
JERRY D. CRAIG xxx-xx-x...
JOHN L. CRAIG xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS R. CRAIN xxx-xx-x...
CONRAD C. CRANE xxx-xx-x...
EUGENE H. CRANOR xxx-xx-x...
CONRAD E. CRAWFORD xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT W. CRAWFORD xxx-xx-x...
ROY P. CRAWFORD xxx-xx-x...
KEITH M. CROMARTIE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT A. CRONIN xxx-xx-x...
EVERETTE * CRUMPLEY xxx-xx-x...
RONALD R. CUNITZ xxx-xx-x...
GARY G. DACEY xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY M. DANIEL xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH R. * DANIELS xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM E. DARDEN xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES E. DARWIN xxx-xx-x...
DONALD P. DAUGHERTY xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS V. DAULA xxx-xx-x...
PETER G. DAUSEN xxx-xx-x...
CARL J. DAVID xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM C. DAVIS xxx-xx-x...
JOHN E. DAVIES xxx-xx-x...
DANNY M. DAVIS xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY W. DAVIS xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT L. DAVIS xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT M. DAVIS xxx-xx-x...
RONALD V. DAVIS xxx-xx-x...
STANLEY C. DAVIS xxx-xx-x...
TED E. DAVIS, I xxx-xx-x...
PAUL L. DAY xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS J. DAY xxx-xx-x...
JULIA A. DEAN xxx-xx-x...
MARK K. DEAN xxx-xx-x...
MARVIN K. DECKER xxx-xx-x...
MICHEL L. DEETER xxx-xx-x...
ROY S. DEFORD xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT H. DELACRUZ xxx-xx-x...
JOHN L. DELLAJACOCONI xxx-xx-x...
JAMES W. DELONY xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT A. DEMENI xxx-xx-x...
KEIKO I. DENBEAU xxx-xx-x...
ALLEN DEUTSCH xxx-xx-x...
CORTEZ K. DIAL xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. DIBERT xxx-xx-x...
DALE E. DICKMAN xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY P. DIERKS xxx-xx-x...
EMILIO DIGIORGIO xxx-xx-x...
MARK W. DILLE xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD F. DILLON xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT E. DILLON xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN M. DISILVIO xxx-xx-x...
DAVID DLUGOLENSKI xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH G. DODD xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM W. DOB xxx-xx-x...
HERBERT DOLLAHITE xxx-xx-x...
GARY DONALDSON xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT R. DONOHO xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE C. DOTON xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. DOUTHITT xxx-xx-x...
JAN S. DRABCZUK xxx-xx-x...
ANN K. DRACH xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM L. DRIVER xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES E. DUBE xxx-xx-x...
KERRY B. DUNABLE xxx-xx-x...
LARRY R. DUNAVANT xxx-xx-x...
COLIN K. DUNN xxx-xx-x...
MARK A. DUNN xxx-xx-x...
ANN E. DUNWOODY xxx-xx-x...
DWIGHT S. DURHAM xxx-xx-x...
RONALD W. DYCHES xxx-xx-x...
FREDERICK L. EADES xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. EDGECOMB xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE N. EDWARDS xxx-xx-x...
JACKIE L. EDWARDS xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM T. EDWARDS xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW G. ELLIS xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY W. ELLISON xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS D. ERICKSON xxx-xx-x...
JOAN E. ERNST xxx-xx-x...

MICHAEL E. ERNZEN xxx-xx-x...
MARCENE ETHERSON xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT E. ETHERIDGE xxx-xx-x...
FREDERICK M. EVANS xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY H. EVENSTAL xxx-xx-x...
ARTHUR E. EXTEN xxx-xx-x...
WILL FAISTENHAMMER xxx-xx-x...
KENJI C. FARINELLI xxx-xx-x...
DONNA FARMER xxx-xx-x...
JAY E. FARWELL xxx-xx-x...
BARBARA G. FAST xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. FASTABENDI xxx-xx-x...
LANCE M. FERRO xxx-xx-x...
MARION M. FERGUSON xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN J. FERRELL xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH F. FILL xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD J. FILIBERTI xxx-xx-x...
JAMES W. FISHBACK xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD A. FISHER xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN L. FITZGERALD xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY J. FLICK xxx-xx-x...
DAVID M. FLOOD xxx-xx-x...
JAMES M. FOLAND xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS P. FOOTE xxx-xx-x...
BILLY W. FORRESTER xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS M. FOSTER xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES S. FOWLER xxx-xx-x...
SAMUEL W. FRANCE xxx-xx-x...
RONALD C. FRANCIS xxx-xx-x...
HERBERT L. FRANDSEN xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE J. FRANK xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH FRANKIE, II xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN J. FRAZIER xxx-xx-x...
BENJAMIN FREAKLEY xxx-xx-x...
TERRY W. FREEZE xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL L. FRENCH xxx-xx-x...
DAVID J. FRENCH xxx-xx-x...
DAVID I. FRIEDLI xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS J. FRISCO xxx-xx-x...
JOHN D. FRKETIC xxx-xx-x...
STEWART C. FROST xxx-xx-x...
MANUEL FUENTES xxx-xx-x...
HIROME FUJIO xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES FULLILOVE xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES S. FULMORE xxx-xx-x...
JOYCE C. FULTON xxx-xx-x...
GARY E. GAAL xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM D. GABBARD xxx-xx-x...
BERNARD W. GALING xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS E. GALLEGOS xxx-xx-x...
DONALD A. GALVANINI xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS A. GANDY xxx-xx-x...
MANOLITO GARABATO xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY C. GARDNER xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP N. GARINO xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES P. GATES xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENC GEHLHAUSEN xxx-xx-x...
LOUIS GELLING, JR. xxx-xx-x...
PAUL S. GENDROLIS xxx-xx-x...
HOWARD J. GENETI xxx-xx-x...
RAY C. GERTMAN xxx-xx-x...
PETER W. GIBBONS xxx-xx-x...
MAURICE D. GIBSON xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL J. GILBERT xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH L. GILBREATH xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE H. GILKES xxx-xx-x...
FRANCIS X. GILLIS xxx-xx-x...
CHARL GLEICHENHAUS xxx-xx-x...
ELAINE G. GODZAK xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. GOETZ xxx-xx-x...
ALFONSO M. GOMEZ xxx-xx-x...
JESS L. GOODMAN xxx-xx-x...
MARY G. GOODWIN xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM P. GOODWIN xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT L. GORE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT G. GORRIE xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN GOTOWICKI xxx-xx-x...
DALE E. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x...
JAMES L. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x...
JOHN K. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x...
DALE R. GRANGER xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS GRANSBERG xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE D. GRANT xxx-xx-x...
LEONARD A. GRASSO xxx-xx-x...
RALPH H. GRAVES xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN J. GREANEY xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW J. GREEN xxx-xx-x...
DERRELL W. GREENE xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. GREGORY xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES R. GRIMM xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN GROSNER xxx-xx-x...
MARK J. GRUENER xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD S. GULA xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT T. GUNNING xxx-xx-x...
KARL J. GUNZELMAN xxx-xx-x...
LARRY R. GWALTNEY xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. HAETINGER xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. HAFELI xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL K. HAINLINE xxx-xx-x...
JAMES H. HAINSTON xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. HALES xxx-xx-x...
DONALD HALEY xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES W. HALL xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN S. HALTER xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN P. HAM xxx-xx-x...
ANNA B. HAMEL xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. HAMES xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD A. HAMILTON xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN C. HAMILTON xxx-xx-x...
THEODORA HAMILTON xxx-xx-x...
MARY A. HAMMOND xxx-xx-x...
DAVID P. HANSON xxx-xx-x...

HERSCHEL C. HARDEN xxx-xx-x...
 GARY L. HARRELL xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT L. HARRISON xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN L. HARRINGTON xxx-xx-x...
 GEORGE C. HARRIS xxx-xx-x...
 DOUGLAS D. HARRISON xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS M. HARRISON xxx-xx-x...
 GLENN J. HARROLL xxx-xx-x...
 GERARD J. HART xxx-xx-x...
 DANIEL J. HARTMANN xxx-xx-x...
 TIMOTHY W. HARTSELL xxx-xx-x...
 PETER R. HARVELL xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL C. HARVEY xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT A. HASS xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM A. HASTIN xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT N. HATTON xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT J. HAUSER xxx-xx-x...
 CARL E. HAWKINS xxx-xx-x...
 EGON F. HAWRYLAN xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL N. HAWRYLAN xxx-xx-x...
 EDWARD A. HAYES xxx-xx-x...
 GRANT C. HAYES xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL T. HAYES xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS H. HAYES xxx-xx-x...
 GWENDOLYN HAYS xxx-xx-x...
 MARK W. HAYS xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN A. HAZEL xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL L. HELFERT xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID C. HELMA xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL K. HELMS xxx-xx-x...
 MARK HENDERSON xxx-xx-x...
 OSSIE L. HENDRIX xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM O. HENRY xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL D. HEREDIA xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES R. HERRICK xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL D. HESS xxx-xx-x...
 RANDY R. HEYWARD xxx-xx-x...
 JANET E. HICKS xxx-xx-x...
 LARRY J. HICKS xxx-xx-x...
 JOSE A. HIDALGO xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES S. HILEY xxx-xx-x...
 AMYL J. HILL xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS N. HINKEL xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES T. HIRA xxx-xx-x...
 ANDREW *HOCHREITER xxx-xx-x...
 AMBROSE R. HOCK xxx-xx-x...
 DERYL L. HOLLAND xxx-xx-x...
 MICH HOLLINGSWORTH xxx-xx-x...
 GARY L. HOLLISTER xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES M. HOLMES xxx-xx-x...
 JIMMY D. HOLTON xxx-xx-x...
 WALTER L. HOLTON xxx-xx-x...
 JONATHAN E. HOLTS xxx-xx-x...
 JAY W. HOOD xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN A. HOOD xxx-xx-x...
 LINDA M. HOODS xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD D. HOPKINS xxx-xx-x...
 STEPHEN B. HOWARD xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS B. HOWE xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM D. HOWLET xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS J. HOWLEY xxx-xx-x...
 KEITH M. HUBER xxx-xx-x...
 LEE D. HUDSON xxx-xx-x...
 RANDY F. HUDSON xxx-xx-x...
 RANDALL L. HUGHES xxx-xx-x...
 PATRICK M. HUMPHREY xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES R. HUNSAKER xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL D. HUNT xxx-xx-x...
 OLIVER H. HUNTER xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT D. HUNTER xxx-xx-x...
 KENNETH W. HUNZIKER xxx-xx-x...
 DOUGLAS HUTHWAITE xxx-xx-x...
 GEORGE D. HYPES xxx-xx-x...
 DANIEL D. IMHOLTE xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES H. INSKEEP xxx-xx-x...
 DOMINIC J. IZZO xxx-xx-x...
 EDWIN B. JACKSON xxx-xx-x...
 JONATHAN F. JACKSON xxx-xx-x...
 PATRICIA K. JACKSON xxx-xx-x...
 RUFUS P. JACKSON xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN T. JACOBS xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN J. JAKUBOWSKI xxx-xx-x...
 EDWIN P. JANASKY xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT B. JARRELL xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIE M. *JENNINGS xxx-xx-x...
 JULIAN D. JENSEN xxx-xx-x...
 WALTER T. JERVIS xxx-xx-x...
 LUIS A. *JIMENEZ xxx-xx-x...
 LARRY W. JINKINS xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM T. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
 DONALD M. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
 JERRY D. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN H. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
 LARRY J. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
 OWEN N. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD M. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT E. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
 RONALD L. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
 DUWAYNE W. JONES xxx-xx-x...
 EDWARD D. JONES xxx-xx-x...
 FRANCIS X. JONES xxx-xx-x...
 FREDDIE R. JONES xxx-xx-x...
 HARVEY D. JONES xxx-xx-x...
 RICHMOND G. JONES xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT A. JONES xxx-xx-x...
 RODRICK L. JONES xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS L. JONES xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM E. JONES xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM S. JONES xxx-xx-x...
 THEODORE JONGEBLOED xxx-xx-x...
 LLOYD W. JORDAN xxx-xx-x...

RICHARD KAMAKARIS xxx-xx-x...
 JASON K. KAMIYA xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD KANESHIRO xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES J. KANIECKI xxx-xx-x...
 PAUL B. KAPPELMAN xxx-xx-x...
 JAN S. KARCO xxx-xx-x...
 JEFFREY W. KARHOIS xxx-xx-x...
 DANIEL G. KARIS xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM G. KASTNER xxx-xx-x...
 PAUL D. KELLER xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS KELLER xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES A. KELLEY xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN T. KELLEY xxx-xx-x...
 KEVIN C. KELLEY xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL P. KELLEY xxx-xx-x...
 GERALD R. KEMP xxx-xx-x...
 DONNA L. KENLEY xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN T. KENNEY xxx-xx-x...
 SUSAN A. KEPLER xxx-xx-x...
 DOUGLAS KEY xxx-xx-x...
 STEPHEN D. KIDDER xxx-xx-x...
 WAYNE D. KILLIAN xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLOTTE KIMBALL xxx-xx-x...
 MARY C. KIMMEL xxx-xx-x...
 ALAN T. KIMURA xxx-xx-x...
 MARK R. KINDL xxx-xx-x...
 EDWARD C. KING xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS KING xxx-xx-x...
 PETER C. KINNEY xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT S. KIRSCH xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM KISKOWSKI xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT C. KLASS xxx-xx-x...
 DOROTHY F. KLASSE xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT KLEYSTUEBER xxx-xx-x...
 MATTHEW S. KLIMOW xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN W. KLING xxx-xx-x...
 JEFFREY J. KNAPI xxx-xx-x...
 MAX L. KNIGHT xxx-xx-x...
 WAYNE R. KNISKERN xxx-xx-x...
 CURTIS L. KNOTT xxx-xx-x...
 FLOYD E. KNOX xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES R. KOCH xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES R. KOENIG xxx-xx-x...
 TED O. KOSTICH xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL J. KOZUP xxx-xx-x...
 TIMOTHY A. KRAATZ xxx-xx-x...
 GARY R. KRAUSE xxx-xx-x...
 CLIFFORD D. KRESS xxx-xx-x...
 CARL J. KROPP xxx-xx-x...
 DONALD KROPP xxx-xx-x...
 DALE W. KRUGER xxx-xx-x...
 NEIL P. KRUKAR xxx-xx-x...
 ALAN D. KRUSE xxx-xx-x...
 DANIEL J. KULLICH xxx-xx-x...
 PETER A. KUNZE xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT J. KURTZ xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD KUZMA xxx-xx-x...
 FRANCOIS LABREQUE xxx-xx-x...
 CHRISTOPHER LACOUR xxx-xx-x...
 ALVIN L. LAMBERT xxx-xx-x...
 MARK W. LANGENDORF xxx-xx-x...
 DONALD L. LANGRIDGE xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN R. LANIER xxx-xx-x...
 LAWREN LANZILLOTTI xxx-xx-x...
 PHILIP A. LAPERLA xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM F. LARAMORE xxx-xx-x...
 STEPHEN A. LAROCCA xxx-xx-x...
 SCOTT LARABEE xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES L. LAUGHLIN xxx-xx-x...
 JOSEPH N. LEBOEUF xxx-xx-x...
 GERALD A. LECHLITER xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES B. LEE xxx-xx-x...
 GEORGE R. LEE xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES E. LEE xxx-xx-x...
 TED A. LEEMANN xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL A. LEEPER xxx-xx-x...
 JOSEPH R. LEGATO xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT C. LEICHT xxx-xx-x...
 HARRY L. LEIFERMAN xxx-xx-x...
 JACKSON P. LEIWIG xxx-xx-x...
 BYRON R. LESTER xxx-xx-x...
 GORDON W. LESTER xxx-xx-x...
 LLOYD LETCHER, JR xxx-xx-x...
 DENNIS R. LEWIS xxx-xx-x...
 JOSEPH W. LEWIS xxx-xx-x...
 EDMUND W. LIBBY xxx-xx-x...
 LINDA L. LINDEN xxx-xx-x...
 BOBBY A. LITTLE xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL R. LLOYD xxx-xx-x...
 ANDREW G. LOERCH xxx-xx-x...
 ARTIS T. LOFTON xxx-xx-x...
 GLEN C. LONG, JR xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL D. LOPEZ xxx-xx-x...
 JOHNNY T. LOPEZ xxx-xx-x...
 ANTHONY N. LOVE xxx-xx-x...
 DALLAS T. LOWER xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES R. LOY xxx-xx-x...
 JOEL A. LUCAS xxx-xx-x...
 JUDITH A. LUCRETI xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS G. LUEBKE xxx-xx-x...
 REID K. LUND xxx-xx-x...
 TIMOTHY M. LUTHE xxx-xx-x...
 PATRICK J. LUSK xxx-xx-x...
 DOUGLAS E. LUTHE xxx-xx-x...
 MYRON C. LYNCH xxx-xx-x...
 BRUCE J. LYSNE xxx-xx-x...
 PATRICK D. MACB xxx-xx-x...
 MARIO C. MACCEIRA xxx-xx-x...
 DOUGLAS MACGREGOR xxx-xx-x...
 BOB D. MACKENZIE xxx-xx-x...
 JOSEPH P. MACKIN xxx-xx-x...
 STEPHEN MACKINNON xxx-xx-x...

FRENCH L. MACLEAN xxx-xx-x...
 GORDON S. MACRAE xxx-xx-x...
 PETER T. MADSEN xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID D. MAGNIN xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN C. MAINWARING xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT J. MALKEMES xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES A. MARKS xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN E. MARKSTHNER xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN R. MARSH xxx-xx-x...
 JIMMY L. MARSHALL xxx-xx-x...
 GEORGE P. MARTIN xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN R. MARTIN xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM H. MARVIN xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN C. MATOUSEK xxx-xx-x...
 RODGER M. MATTHEWS xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD MATTINGLY xxx-xx-x...
 DEAN E. MATTSOON xxx-xx-x...
 GEORGE E. MAUSER xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES J. MAYE, II xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS J. MAYOOK xxx-xx-x...
 RUSSELL J. MAZIARKA xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT H. MCBRIDE xxx-xx-x...
 MARGARET MCCARTER xxx-xx-x...
 KAREN L. MCCLELLAN xxx-xx-x...
 DENNIS J. MCCOMAR xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM H. MCCOY xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES C. MCDANIEL xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES E. MCDANIEL xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES H. MCDOLE xxx-xx-x...
 JACK L. MCDONALD xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN H. MCDONALD xxx-xx-x...
 DENNIS M. MCFARLAND xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES H. MCGARRAH xxx-xx-x...
 DONALD J. MCGRAW xxx-xx-x...
 KENNETH S. MCGRAW xxx-xx-x...
 DENNIS M. MCGUCKIAN xxx-xx-x...
 ALAN D. MCKEAG xxx-xx-x...
 FRED L. MCKENNEY xxx-xx-x...
 CAROL E. MCKENZIE xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID E. MCKILLIP xxx-xx-x...
 ALEX B. MCKINDRA xxx-xx-x...
 JESSE E. MCKINNEY xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT W. MCKINNEY xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERTA A. MCKINNEY xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES D. MCKISSICK xxx-xx-x...
 JIM MCMAHON xxx-xx-x...
 JOSEPH B. MCMILLAN xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM N. MCMILLAN xxx-xx-x...
 GARY K. MCMILLEN xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN J. MCNALLY xxx-xx-x...
 TIMOTHY C. MCNEEL xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID F. MELCHER xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT D. MERKLE xxx-xx-x...
 MARSHALL D. MERRISS xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT M. METHENY xxx-xx-x...
 STANLEY E. MEYER xxx-xx-x...
 DANIEL R. MEZZETTI xxx-xx-x...
 ALPHONSO L. MIDGETT xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS MIKALOUSKAS xxx-xx-x...
 CHAMPE W. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
 DENNIS M. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
 FRANK W. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
 JOE R. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
 RONALD H. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM D. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD G. MILLET xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID F. MILLS xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES R. MITCHAM xxx-xx-x...
 RANDALL R. MITCHELL xxx-xx-x...
 TERRY L. MITCHELL xxx-xx-x...
 BENJAMIN R. MIXON xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL E. MIZELL xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID M. MOAK xxx-xx-x...
 JERRY T. MOHR xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN M. MOLINO xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL R. MOLOSSO xxx-xx-x...
 GERALD F. MONIN xxx-xx-x...
 STEPHEN A. MONKS xxx-xx-x...
 GEORGE MONTGOMERY xxx-xx-x...
 ALAN E. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES D. * MOORE xxx-xx-x...
 CHARLES R. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
 EDWARD J. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
 EDWARD T. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN H. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
 LARRY D. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
 DENNIS C. MORAN xxx-xx-x...
 TERRY S. MOREAU xxx-xx-x...
 GARY E. MORGAN xxx-xx-x...
 MARCIA R. MORGAN xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD D. MORRIS xxx-xx-x...
 ALTON D. MORRISON xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL W. MORROW xxx-xx-x...
 DWIGHT E. MORSE xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT M. MORTON xxx-xx-x...
 GARY J. MOTSEK xxx-xx-x...
 JULIAN M. MOUNT xxx-xx-x...
 JAN E. MURAWSKY xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD E. MURPHY xxx-xx-x...
 JOSEPH P. MURRAY xxx-xx-x...
 PAUL J. MYERS xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT L. MYERS xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES R. MYLES xxx-xx-x...
 ROGER A. NADEAU xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN P. NAGLE xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD H. NEAL xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM B. NEAL xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM R. NEALSON xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID E. NEELY xxx-xx-x...
 RAY A. NELSON xxx-xx-x...
 RAYMOND C. NELSON xxx-xx-x...
 HOWARD A. NEMETSKY xxx-xx-x...

EDWARD W. NEWING xxx-xx-x...
LARRY C. NEWMAN xxx-xx-x...
EARL NICKS xxx-xx-x...
GARY NIEDERLANDER xxx-xx-x...
STANLEY M. NIEMIEC xxx-xx-x...
DENNEY K. NIVENS xxx-xx-x...
PATRICIA L. NOLLIN xxx-xx-x...
ROBBY A. NOONE xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW C. NORDBY xxx-xx-x...
FREDERIC G. NORITAKE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN D. NORWOOD xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD W. NOWINSKI xxx-xx-x...
AMELIA C. NUTT xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. OBAL xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL D. OBRIEN xxx-xx-x...
JAMES J. OBRIEN xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND T. ODIERNO xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES F. ODOM xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD C. OERTEL xxx-xx-x...
LEONARD W. OGBORN xxx-xx-x...
BRYAN L. OLIVER xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE F. OLIVER xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN F. ONELLI xxx-xx-x...
JOHN W. ORAVIS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID K. OSBORN xxx-xx-x...
REX N. OSBORN xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH W. OSMOND xxx-xx-x...
PAUL F. O'SULLIVAN xxx-xx-x...
STEPHAN V. OTTESSEN xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE T. PALMATIER xxx-xx-x...
CLINTON E. PALMER xxx-xx-x...
ERVIN J. PANCOAST xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE M. PARKER xxx-xx-x...
KERRY R. PARKER xxx-xx-x...
LEON A. PARKER xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM E. PARKER xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY H. PARLIEN xxx-xx-x...
ALAN B. PASS xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS L. PATRICK xxx-xx-x...
ZACHARY PATTERSON xxx-xx-x...
JACK E. PATTISON xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY D. PATZ xxx-xx-x...
JEREL E. PAWLEY xxx-xx-x...
JERRY P. PECK xxx-xx-x...
TERRY M. PECK xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. PEEBLES xxx-xx-x...
ELLIS L. PENNINGTON xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN M. PENTECCOST xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS L. PENTECCOST xxx-xx-x...
DUANE A. PEPPER xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY D. PEPPER xxx-xx-x...
CARLOS A. PEREZ xxx-xx-x...
EDWIN M. PERRY xxx-xx-x...
MATTHEW E. PERRY xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND E. PETERSON xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN P. PETERSON xxx-xx-x...
GARY B. PETTIT xxx-xx-x...
PAUL A. PETTY xxx-xx-x...
ALVIN K. PHILLIPS xxx-xx-x...
GARY E. PHILLIPS xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD L. PHILLIPS xxx-xx-x...
RONNIE D. PHILPOT xxx-xx-x...
FRED P. PICKENS xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM G. PIERCE xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS W. PINKHAM xxx-xx-x...
JERRY W. PINSON xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT C. PINSON xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM H. POIRIER xxx-xx-x...
WALTER W. POLLEY xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS L. POLMATEER xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD F. POLON xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH C. POPP xxx-xx-x...
JOHN H. PORTER xxx-xx-x...
TERRENCE M. POWERS xxx-xx-x...
NATHAN J. POWER xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY D. PRATER xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD J. PREECE xxx-xx-x...
GERALD A. PRENTICE xxx-xx-x...
DONALD E. PRIBBLE xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH W. PRICE xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM R. PRICE xxx-xx-x...
FRANK L. PRINDLE xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES W. PROTASIS xxx-xx-x...
MARGARET E. PUCKETT xxx-xx-x...
RODGER A. PUDWILL xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL D. PURATH xxx-xx-x...
NEIL L. PUTZ xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL M. QUINN xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH D. QUINN xxx-xx-x...
JIMMY M. RABON xxx-xx-x...
JOHN J. RAHAUESER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN A. RALETT xxx-xx-x...
ARTHUR A. RASPER xxx-xx-x...
MARYANNE F. RAUEN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. REAGAN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID W. REANEY xxx-xx-x...
PETER J. REDDING xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL E. REDISKE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT E. REED xxx-xx-x...
MATTHEW P. REESE xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM W. REESE xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. REEVES xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN V. REEVES xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH H. REFT xxx-xx-x...
DAVID REGAN xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM L. REINHART xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. RELYEA xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN P. REYNOLDS xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD G. REYNOLDS xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM F. REYNOLDS xxx-xx-x...
GARY D. RHAY xxx-xx-x...
CARL B. RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x...

MELVIN E. RICHMOND xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD C. RIDENOUR xxx-xx-x...
ROY RIDLEY xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD M. RIESS xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY A. RIPPE xxx-xx-x...
MARTIN L. ROBBINS xxx-xx-x...
FRANK N. ROBERTS xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH ROBERTSON xxx-xx-x...
CRAIG T. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x...
FRED D. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN R. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x...
WILLARD J. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x...
JUAN G. ROBLES xxx-xx-x...
DENIS G. ROCHETTE xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD R. ROCKS xxx-xx-x...
CRAIG E. RODGERS xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH O. RODRIGUEZ xxx-xx-x...
GARY B. RODEVELT xxx-xx-x...
VICTOR W. ROESKE xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY V. ROGERS xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL W. ROGERS xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL J. ROHR xxx-xx-x...
NED B. ROPER xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES A. ROSE xxx-xx-x...
VICTOR M. ROSELL xxx-xx-x...
HY S. ROTHSTEIN xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD J. ROWE xxx-xx-x...
GARY A. ROYSTER xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH A. RUFFIN xxx-xx-x...
FRED A. RUNNELS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID W. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x...
SHARIE H. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN T. RYAN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. RYAN xxx-xx-x...
PAUL O. SAFFORD xxx-xx-x...
JAMIEL S. SALIBA xxx-xx-x...
MILTON A. SALTER xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN C. SAMPLE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERTO SANTIAGO xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHE SARGENT xxx-xx-x...
KURT R. SAULSBURY xxx-xx-x...
QUENTIN SCHILLAR xxx-xx-x...
HAROLD S. SCHMIDT xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS SCHMIDT xxx-xx-x...
DAVID E. SCHNABEL xxx-xx-x...
DAVID H. SCHOCK xxx-xx-x...
PAUL F. SCHOEN xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH SCHOENBORN xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN P. SCHOOK xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH SCHROEDER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN W. SCHWARZ xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES SCHWOEBEL xxx-xx-x...
LLOYD M. SCOTT xxx-xx-x...
BARRY L. SCRIBNER xxx-xx-x...
GRATTON O. SEALOCK xxx-xx-x...
WAYNE R. SEARS xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL J. SEASTRUM xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT L. SEAVER xxx-xx-x...
TEDDY R. SEEL xxx-xx-x...
DEAN H. SEITZ xxx-xx-x...
MARGARET M. SEITZ xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT M. SEITZ xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY L. SHAFER xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN A. SHAMBAUGH xxx-xx-x...
DAVID M. SHANAHAN xxx-xx-x...
LARRY C. SHANAHAN xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN W. SHANAHAN xxx-xx-x...
JOHN J. SHAW xxx-xx-x...
JAMES D. SHIFFFIELD xxx-xx-x...
JAMES F. SHIVERS xxx-xx-x...
LINDA J. SHOCKLEY xxx-xx-x...
JOHN F. SHORTAL xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. SHROUT xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL W. SIDWELL xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT W. SIEGERT xxx-xx-x...
MARK SIEMER xxx-xx-x...
ART SIEMONAP xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT R. SIGL xxx-xx-x...
JAMES E. SIKES xxx-xx-x...
HARRY G. SIMMETH xxx-xx-x...
HOLLIS E. SIMONS xxx-xx-x...
PETER C. SIMONCIN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL W. SIMPSON xxx-xx-x...
JERRY W. SISCO xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES M. SIPHER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN W. SKIDMORE xxx-xx-x...
DAVID M. SLAUGHTER xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. SLOTWINSKI xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT W. SLUPIN xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS D. SMART xxx-xx-x...
ARNOLD SMITH xxx-xx-x...
DONNA SMITH xxx-xx-x...
EARNEST C. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
ELIAS S. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
ERIC F. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE R. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
JOHN B. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
KIMBERLEY T. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
MARC A. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL L. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL L. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
MORRIS S. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT E. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
STEPHAN G. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN K. SNAPP xxx-xx-x...
WILBERT L. SNITCH xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS L. SNYDER xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM R. SOLE xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM SONDERVAN xxx-xx-x...
MARY J. SONNTAG xxx-xx-x...
CLARK B. SORENSEN xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE J. SOWA xxx-xx-x...

RICHARD D. SPEAK xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN M. SPENCER xxx-xx-x...
MARK W. SQUIRE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN E. SRAJ xxx-xx-x...
KEITH R. STAFFORD xxx-xx-x...
ALAN B. STAHL xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY J. STAMILLIO xxx-xx-x...
RANDELL STANSFIELD xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD M. STARK xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH STEGGEMAN xxx-xx-x...
TERRANC STEINHEBEL xxx-xx-x...
FREDERICK STELLAR xxx-xx-x...
RONALD STELMASCZYK xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS STEPHENSEN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID S. STEVENS xxx-xx-x...
JOHN G. STOKOUS xxx-xx-x...
BOBBY R. STOLBERG xxx-xx-x...
ALAN G. STOVALL xxx-xx-x...
JESS M. STRATTON xxx-xx-x...
JAMES R. STRICKLAND xxx-xx-x...
MARTIN R. STRICKLAND xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY STRICKLER xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL C. STRIPLIN xxx-xx-x...
ALLEN STROUPHAUER xxx-xx-x...
PETER J. STUART xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE SUMMERS xxx-xx-x...
HARRY E. SUTTON xxx-xx-x...
GUY C. SWAN xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES F. SWANSON xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY H. SWANSON xxx-xx-x...
GARY G. SWENSON xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS M. SWINGEN xxx-xx-x...
MARK L. SWINSON xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY T. TANNEN xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. TARR xxx-xx-x...
LENNON A. TATUM xxx-xx-x...
ERROL S. TAVER xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS C. TAYLOR xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS E. TAYLOR xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD G. TERAQ xxx-xx-x...
GARY S. TERHUNE xxx-xx-x...
RUSSELL H. THADEN xxx-xx-x...
CARTER S. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
KENT D. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
PATRICK A. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT F. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
ROOSEVELT P. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN G. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN R. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE W. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x...
FRANK J. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x...
LEE A. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT P. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x...
MARIL THORBJORNSEN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL THORNBERG xxx-xx-x...
SMITH P. THORNTON xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM H. THROOP xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE E. THURMOND xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM V. TIERNEY xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY T. TILSON xxx-xx-x...
DAVIS D. TINDOLL xxx-xx-x...
PAUL E. TIPTON xxx-xx-x...
ROGER W. TODD xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN R. TODD xxx-xx-x...
TERRY H. TONSON xxx-xx-x...
OMER C. TOOLEY xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES L. TOOMEY xxx-xx-x...
MARY L. TORGERSEN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID F. TOSCH xxx-xx-x...
BARRY N. TOTTELL xxx-xx-x...
PAUL J. TRAMPET xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN R. TRAUTER xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN G. TRENT xxx-xx-x...
DAVID F. TREUTNING xxx-xx-x...
JAMES E. TRIMBLE xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY R. TRIMBLE xxx-xx-x...
GARY L. TRINKLE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT W. TROS' xxx-xx-x...
JOHN F. TROXELL xxx-xx-x...
HAROLD A. TUCKER xxx-xx-x...
ABRAHAM J. TURNER xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP I. TUTTLE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN J. TWOHIG xxx-xx-x...
DAVID W. TYNER xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE T. TYSON xxx-xx-x...
MARK L. UHART xxx-xx-x...
CAROL L. UMSTADT xxx-xx-x...
FERNANDO A. URRUTIA xxx-xx-x...
JAMES L. UTLEY xxx-xx-x...
RONALD W. VANDIVER xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE VANLAETHEM xxx-xx-x...
JAMES G. VANPATTEN xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES VANSISTINE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN A. VANVLEET xxx-xx-x...
DALE W. VARGA xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD F. VAUGHN xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE E. VAUPEL xxx-xx-x...
JOSE A. VAZQUEZ xxx-xx-x...
REGINALD VAILLUX xxx-xx-x...
BARRY L. VELARDE xxx-xx-x...
HERMINIO VELAZQUEZ xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES J. VENABLE xxx-xx-x...
JOSE G. VENTURA xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD L. VINCENT xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE VISOCAN xxx-xx-x...
ERIC VONDERSCHER xxx-xx-x...
JOANN M. VONHOLTUM xxx-xx-x...
SEAN M. WACHUTKA xxx-xx-x...
STEWART L. WADE xxx-xx-x...
KEITH C. WALKER xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD T. WALLACE xxx-xx-x...
LAMONTE W. WALLER xxx-xx-x...

DAVID L. WALLINGER xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN E. WALUS xxx-xx-x...
 MARK E. WARNER xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID G. WARREN xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT M. WATERS xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM G. WATERS xxx-xx-x...
 DANIEL C. WATKINS xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM J. WATTS xxx-xx-x...
 BRETT H. WEAVER xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID F. WEAVER xxx-xx-x...
 KENNETH E. WEBBER xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT J. WEBER xxx-xx-x...
 ROXANNA M. WEIR xxx-xx-x...
 GEORGE W. WEIR xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM A. WEIR xxx-xx-x...
 GORDON D. WEITH xxx-xx-x...
 HERBERT W. WELLS xxx-xx-x...
 JAMES A. WELLS xxx-xx-x...
 LAMONT J. WELLS xxx-xx-x...
 LEON G. WELLS xxx-xx-x...
 STEVEN E. WELLS xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN D. WELT xxx-xx-x...

GREGORY K. WESTRUM xxx-xx-x...
 DEWEY D. WHEAT xxx-xx-x...
 STEPHEN G. WHEBBER xxx-xx-x...
 DAVID C. WHITE xxx-xx-x...
 ELMER G. WHITE xxx-xx-x...
 JERRY R. WHITE xxx-xx-x...
 MOSES J. WHITEHURST xxx-xx-x...
 DOUGLAS WHITESIDE xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL L. WHITMAN xxx-xx-x...
 DONALD E. WILBOURN xxx-xx-x...
 ERIC R. WILDEMANN xxx-xx-x...
 GLENN F. WILKINSON xxx-xx-x...
 GARY A. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
 GEORGE K. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
 PATRICIA WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
 ROBERT M. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
 COLEN K. WILLIS xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS G. WILLS xxx-xx-x...
 HOWARD S. WILSON xxx-xx-x...
 MICHAEL T. WILSON xxx-xx-x...
 W. M. WINFIELD xxx-xx-x...
 DUARD S. WOFFINDEN xxx-xx-x...

PAUL G. WOLFE xxx-xx-x...
 JEROME B. WOLFF xxx-xx-x...
 ALFRED H. WOLTZ xxx-xx-x...
 SAMUEL S. WOOD xxx-xx-x...
 HARMAN O. WOODS xxx-xx-x...
 THOMAS E. WOOSLEY xxx-xx-x...
 DOUGLAS L. WOOTRING xxx-xx-x...
 JOHN D. WRAY xxx-xx-x...
 JEFFREY M. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM B. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x...
 DONALD R. YATES xxx-xx-x...
 STEPHEN R. YERBY xxx-xx-x...
 HERMAN R. YEZAK xxx-xx-x...
 TERRY R. YOUNGBLUTE xxx-xx-x...
 DONALD H. ZACHERL xxx-xx-x...
 RICHARD P. ZAHNER xxx-xx-x...
 CHERYL H. *ZALES xxx-xx-x...
 STEVEN G. ZEHETMIR xxx-xx-x...
 ANDREW H. ZIEGLER xxx-xx-x...
 CRAIG L. ZIMMERMAN xxx-xx-x...
 WILLIAM B. ZINK xxx-xx-x...
 SUSAN ZIVNUSKA xxx-xx-x...